

PENNSYLVANIA

Minnie Mae Grey, Boston, Pa., in place of Marjorie Lowery, removed.
 Chester J. Kukleski, Braddock, Pa., in place of Jennie Moran, retired.
 Daniel J. Cullinan, Cambridge Springs, Pa., in place of A. F. Ellis, resigned.
 Rosemary F. Schettig, Ebensburg, Pa., in place of A. M. Schettig, retired.
 James S. Newton, Ellwood City, Pa., T. A. Wilson, retired.
 Donald J. Watts, Millville, Pa., in place of J. C. Watts, deceased.
 Arthur E. Stanfield, Renfrew, Pa., in place of Lafayette Lawrence, retired.
 Ralph M. Henry, Rochester Mills, Pa., in place of W. M. Stewart, transferred.
 David M. Barnhart, Stoystown, Pa., in place of F. J. Fulton, retired.
 Carrie M. Ketner, Strausstown, Pa., in place of C. W. Henne, retired.
 Sarah E. Vensel, West Alexander, Pa., in place of C. C. Davis, resigned.
 Jerry J. Kasprisin, Yukon, Pa., in place of Jenny Paterson, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William L. Antley, Elloree, S. C., in place of E. B. Mack, removed.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John Obenauer, Eureka, S. Dak., in place of E. L. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
 Vaino E. Bajuniemi, Lake Norden, S. Dak., in place of F. L. Hayes, resigned.
 Ralph L. Fossum, Lily, S. Dak., in place of D. I. Olson, deceased.
 Delmar J. Hamiel, Reliance, S. Dak., in place of F. J. Bowar, deceased.
 Ardean A. Twite, Veblen, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Simpson, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Clayre Wesley White, Bethpage, Tenn., in place of L. D. Seay, retired.
 Garland T. Wilson, Cottagegrove, Tenn., in place of W. B. Olds, retired.
 Harry M. Patillo, Eagleville, Tenn., in place of H. K. Stephenson, transferred.
 R. Ray Tate, Estill Springs, Tenn., in place of R. G. Leech, transferred.
 Thomas H. Graham, Jr., Taft, Tenn., in place of J. T. Malone, deceased.

TEXAS

Charles V. Speer, Carrizo Springs, Tex., in place of M. E. Cook, deceased.
 Mary D. Maxwell, Country Campus, Tex. Office established September 1, 1948.
 Billy B. Holland, Estelline, Tex., in place of G. J. Ballard, resigned.
 Edna B. Smith, La Vernia, Tex., in place of W. L. Wiseman, transferred.
 Miriam S. Chatelle, Los Fresnos, Tex., in place of H. W. Derda, resigned.
 Mittie L. Taylor, New Willard, Tex., in place of J. H. Victory, resigned.
 Prentice F. Vance, Orangefield, Tex., in place of F. N. Bland, retired.
 Guy H. Holman, Pittsburg, Tex., in place of C. C. Truitt, transferred.
 Ellen C. Woodruff, Port Aransas, Tex., in place of M. V. Denton, resigned.
 Celestia Dodson, Sandia, Tex., in place of M. C. Cox, resigned.

VERMONT

Robert F. Brown, Groton, Vt., in place of G. N. Clark, retired.

VIRGINIA

James R. Jones, Holland, Va., in place of B. W. Council, retired.
 Mary R. J. Sizemore, Hurley, Va., in place of N. J. Carroll, removed.
 Carl S. Hendricks, Lebanon, Va., in place of H. W. Easterly, declined.

WASHINGTON

Margaret Hedrick, Creston, Wash., in place of I. G. Spencer, retired.

Earl C. Carey, Hartline, Wash., in place of R. E. Carey, deceased.
 Florence Opal Hurl, Malden, Wash., in place of E. E. Cain, retired.
 Nels D. Nelson, Naselle, Wash., in place of M. J. Rasmussen, resigned.
 Donald M. Richardson, Tonasket, Wash., in place of D. S. Farver, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Merriman S. Smith, Bluefield, W. Va., in place of R. L. Bailey, resigned.
 Paul M. Satterfield, Carolina, W. Va., in place of T. W. Alkire, resigned.
 Helen M. B. Joyce, Crumpler, W. Va., in place of N. V. Duncan, retired.
 Pansy Lee Seacrist, Montcoal, W. Va., in place of C. M. Nestor, resigned.
 Johnny A. Aliff, Oceana, W. Va., in place of Vida Chambers, retired.
 Junior Lee Gerrard, Wolf Summit, W. Va., in place of J. N. Flanigan, retired.

WISCONSIN

Cecil H. Pandow, Brodhead, Wis., in place of A. G. Anderson, transferred.
 Henry A. Rechlicz, Hales Corners, Wis., in place of W. F. Schreiber, deceased.
 Arthur E. Carstens, Hilbert, Wis., in place of C. H. Eldridge, transferred.
 Bernice M. Matson, Taylor, Wis., in place of C. M. Dunn, retired.
 Hazel B. Mason, Wales, Wis., office became Presidential July 1, 1948.
 Ray J. Heinzen, Whitelaw, Wis., in place of J. A. Heinzen, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we daily be inspired with fidelity to our high calling and trust as leaders in the affairs of government by being loyal to that which is noble and true.

Grant that we may understand that our first loyalty must be to Thee and that this is the basis and inspiration of all the other loyalties of our mortal life.

We confess with sorrow and shame that we are continually violating and breaking faith with the sanctity of this supreme loyalty.

We have failed to see that this is the reason why our social order is weak and in peril and why we are making so little progress in achieving a finer and nobler civilization.

Search and cleanse our minds and hearts and fill them with a greater and more steadfast loyalty to Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 6, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 5, 1950:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 4080. An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps;

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950.

On May 6, 1950:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7797. An act to provide foreign economic assistance.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIRST GENERATION AMERICANS WHO ARE IN CONGRESS FORCIBLY ILLUSTRATE OPPORTUNITIES OPEN TO AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I took a census of Congress to determine how many Members were the sons of immigrants.

It is interesting to note that about 18 percent of the Members of the Eighty-first Congress have one or both parents who came from a foreign country. In other words, almost one out of every five Members is an American citizen of the first generation of his family to live in America.

This illustrates forcibly the advantages and opportunities which the United States offers to its citizens. This group of Members probably have a better conception of the benefits of our citizenship than any other of our citizens. The reason is that they have heard from the lips of their parents the great advantages which this country

offers to its people, compared to the opportunities elsewhere.

Look magazine heard of this and was interested enough in the information, and its importance, to devote a page of their national magazine to printing the list of those who are the sons of immigrants in the present Congress. Look magazine should be congratulated on publishing this information, which so forcibly points up American opportunities.

Following is a list of these Members indicating from what countries their parents migrated to America:

SENATORS

Austria: WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, mother.

Czechoslovakia: ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL, Kansas, mother.

England: GUY CORDON, Oregon, father; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, California, mother; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado, mother; ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah, father and mother.

Germany: HERBERT H. LEHMAN, New York, father and mother.

Ireland: EDWARD L. LEAHY, Rhode Island, father; PAT MCCARRAN, Nevada, father and mother; JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, father and mother; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming, father and mother.

Norway: HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota, mother; EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota, father and mother; ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin, father and mother.

Sweden: CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico, father; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado, father.

REPRESENTATIVES

Alsace-Lorraine: ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan, father and mother.

Austria: JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota, father and mother; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, New York, father and mother; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania, father; JACOB K. JAVITS, New York, father; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York, father and mother; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska, father.

Canada: JAMES V. BUCKLEY, Illinois, father and mother; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island, father and mother; DONALD L. O'TOOLE, New York, father; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Connecticut, mother.

Czechoslovakia: ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois, father and mother; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska, mother.

Denmark: H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota, father and mother; REVA BECK BOSONE, Utah, father; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa, father and mother; NORRIS POULSON, California, father.

England: WESLEY A. D'EWART, Montana, father; GORDON L. McDONOUGH, California, mother; RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington, mother; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois, father; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania, mother; JOHN SANBORN, Idaho, mother.

Germany: LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois, mother; ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, North Carolina, father; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan, mother; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland, father and mother; WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah, mother; RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, Illinois, father; WILLIAM LEMKE, North Dakota, father; EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, Nebraska, mother; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin, father.

Hungary: ARTHUR G. KLEIN, New York, father and mother.

Ireland: FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming, mother; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, father and mother; CLYDE DOYLE, California, father; WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., Pennsylvania, father and mother; JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, New York, father and mother; EDNA F. KELLY, New York, father and mother; PAUL J. KILDAY, Texas, father; THOMAS J. LANE, Massachusetts, father and mother; NEIL J. LINEHAN, Illinois, father; CHRISTOPHER McGRATH, New

York, father; MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, father and mother; MARY T. NORTON, New Jersey, father and mother; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois, father and mother; HARRY P. O'NEILL, Pennsylvania, father and mother; T. VINCENT QUINN, New York, father and mother; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, father and mother; JOHN F. SHELLEY, California, father; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California, father and mother.

Italy: HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey, father and mother; ANTHONY CAVALCANTE, Pennsylvania, father and mother; L. GARY CLEMENTE, New York, father and mother; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan, father; FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts, father; VITO MARCANTONIO, New York, mother; PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey, father; ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, New York, father and mother. Luxembourg: JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan, mother.

Norway: AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota, father and mother; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota, father and mother; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, father and mother; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington, father.

Palestine: JACOB K. JAVITS, New York, mother.

Poland: CHESTER A. CHESNEY, Illinois, father and mother; THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois, father and mother; CHESTER C. GORSKI, New York, father and mother; JOHN LESINSKI, Michigan, father and mother; ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Connecticut, father and mother; ANTONI N. SADLAK, Connecticut, father and mother; GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, Michigan, father and mother; CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, father and mother.

Rumania: LOUIS B. HELLER, New York, father and mother.

Scotland: FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania, father; ROBERT CROSSER, Ohio, father and mother; WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah, father; GORDON L. McDONOUGH, California, father; HUGH B. MITCHELL, Washington, father; ROBERT L. RAMSAY, West Virginia, father and mother.

Spain: ANTONIO FERNOS-ISERN, Puerto Rico, father.

Sweden: LEROY JOHNSON, California, father; WALTER NORELL, Oregon, father.

Wales: IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania, father and mother; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio, father and mother; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois, mother; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania, father; EDWARD H. REES, Kansas, father.

These Congressmen are foreign-born: ROBERT CROSSER, Scotland; NOAH M. MASON, Wales; ROBERT L. RAMSAY, England; ADOLPH J. SABATH, Czechoslovakia; KARL STEFAN, Czechoslovakia; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Canada.

COST OF THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, we still have before us this huge deficit-spending bill of around \$29,000,000,000.

I think the record should show that while we struggle here—week after week, day after day, last Saturday included—trying to reduce these proposed expenditures, President Truman left Washington yesterday afternoon on a tour to advocate new ways of spending money.

If he were making this tour into 16 States to explain to the American people the country's precarious fiscal situation and the absolute necessity of saving every dollar possible, the taxpayers would probably consider this extraordinary ex-

pense estimated at \$250,000 to pay for this trip to be a good investment.

Unfortunately, that is not the purpose of the trip. He is making this trip to repeat his promises of something for everyone which in the end mean nothing for anyone.

The American people recognize that we are in a period of ruinous inflation and well on the road to national bankruptcy, and I do not think President Truman will be able to persuade them to commit financial suicide by adopting his socialistic spending program.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, Dear Mr. President: Bon voyage. The eyes of Texas are upon you.

SEVENTH REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the seventh report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as well as the programs of economic aid to China under section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.), and Public Laws 154 and 196, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States Foreign Relief Program (Public

Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States Foreign Aid Program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended December 31, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 1950.

MILK PRODUCTION IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this House to a fact that is quite frequently overlooked, namely, that the State of New York is the greatest milk-producing State after the great State of Wisconsin.

Our State, I think, most unfortunately, is too often confused and overshadowed by New York City and people outside of our borders are prone to look upon all New Yorkers as city slickers.

I have the honor to represent Delaware County, which county has again, for the tenth consecutive year, been declared in first place as the leading milk-producing county in the State of New York. The 381,000,000 pounds of milk received from this county at pool-approved plants during last year had a value of more than \$15,500,000 at uniform prices, according to the Milk Marketing Administrator. The 10 top counties listed in order of value of milk produced in the State of New York are as follows: Delaware, St. Lawrence, Jefferson, Oneida, Chenango, Madison, Otsego, Herkimer, Orange, also in my district, and Portland Counties.

The total value of milk products produced in the State of New York in the year 1949 was \$366,995,000.

It is therefore fair to say that the dairy industry is one of the most important as well as the most necessary industries in our whole State and also in our Nation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 155]

Angell	Cooley	Gwinn
Barden	Cox	Hall
Barrett, Pa.	Crosser	Edwin Arthur
Bates, Ky.	Davenport	Hare
Bolling	Davies, N. Y.	Hart
Boykin	Dawson	Hays, Ark.
Breen	Deane	Hébert
Buckley, N. Y.	Douglas	Herter
Carlyle	Eaton	Huber
Carnahan	Fernandez	Javits
Case, N. J.	Gilmer	Judd
Case, S. Dak.	Gore	Kearns
Cavalcante	Granahan	Kelley, Pa.
Chatham	Grant	Kennedy
Chudoff	Green	Keogh

Kunkel	Morton	Simpson, Pa.
Lane	Moulder	Smith, Ohio
Larcade	Nelson	Staggers
Lichtenwalter	Nixon	Stigler
Linehan	Norton	Towe
McConnell	Pfeifer,	Underwood
McGrath	Joseph L.	Walsh
McMillen, Ill.	Powell	Werdel
Mack, Ill.	Priest	White, Calif.
Macy	Quinn	Wickersham
Madden	Redden	Willis
Merrow	Rhodes	Wilson, Ind.
Miles	Richards	Wolcott
Miller, Calif.	Roosevelt	Wood
Morgan	Sadlak	
Morrison	Scott, Hardie	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and forty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE TOUR OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's speech-making, handshaking tour is a desperate attempt to convince the voters of Iowa and other States into believing that the President and his party, now in control of Congress and the White House, are in no way responsible for the drop in farm income, wages, and business, which has taken place since his party took control of Congress on January 3, 1949, after 2 years of Republican congressional control during which time farm income, wages, and business was at an all-time high, because during that time our free-enterprise system was permitted to operate full speed ahead without threats, reprisals, or hindrance from Congress.

That free American breathing spell came to an abrupt end in November 1948, because there were too few deep-thinking people who took the time to vote. And what a terrific penalty they and every American has paid ever since.

Also, I have no doubt that the President will tell the people that he and his party have rid the Government of the immoral perverts and communists, when the fact is that had it not been for such fearless, patriotic, public servants as our Senator Hickenlooper, of Iowa, Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, America might well this very moment be dominated completely by the Socialists and Communists in Government, to whom the President has never missed a chance to give aid and comfort.

Now, of course, some folks will go to see the President of the United States. We Americans are big enough to pay due respect to the highest office of our land, but we have also the right as free-born Americans to expect the man who holds that high office to live up to the oath of office he solemnly took and which made him President of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and in-

clude an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Mr. Boris Shishkin, Director of the European Labor Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a statement on Home Demonstration Week.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article on Alaskan statehood and in the other a statement by Mr. Benjamin Fairless.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Star.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper and magazine articles.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Chicago Sun-Times, also an editorial.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter concerning certain imports into the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two

instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in one to include a statement by the distinguished Ira Dean McCoy, doctor of medicine, on the subject The Truth About Federal Health Insurance appearing in the Huron (Mich.) News of February 17; in another to include a letter from the distinguished Admiral C. E. Rosendahl in support of the metal clad lighter-than-air ship; and in another to include a statement, letter, and resolution of the International Union of Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. JACKSON of California as given before the Marine Corps Association on Saturday last.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER IX. CIVIL FUNCTIONS

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to announce that consideration of amendments to chapter VIII of the pending bill was concluded on Saturday last. The Clerk will now begin reading chapter IX on page 332, line 1 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SIGNAL CORPS

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, including purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,000,000, to remain available until the close of the fiscal year 1952, and in addition not to exceed 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the Alaska Communication System may be merged with and used for the purposes of this appropriation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I can hear a 13-car presidential train going down the track with smoke coming out of her old smoke stack, costing the taxpayers \$250,000 for a 10-day political jaunt. It seems to me that is a lot of money, and we ought to know where we are going to get it, and I do not know why we should spend it. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Whistle stop.

Ladies and gentlemen of America, we are now going to tell you that the Brannan plan is the proper thing for this country to take upon yourselves, and just remember that the subsidies that

we are going to pay all of you people are going to help you greatly. Who cares for expenses. Choo-choo-choo rolling down the track. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Here that old train is stopping again.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is on the wrong road. He is in Alaska.

Mr. RICH. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you that the Taft-Hartley Act ought to be changed, but the Congress of the United States would not change it in 2 weeks as I thought they would; months have gone by. It is going to take us 2 years to change it. You will have to elect a lot of people to Congress this fall so that we can change the Taft-Hartley Act, and it is going to cost you a lot of money to do that.

Just remember this, that the train is rolling along now, and the President is telling the people of this country just what is going to happen. If they do not obey his orders.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! Now here we come, citizens. We are going to tell you about the economy that we want in Government. You know, we talk economy and yet we want to spend all the money you can spend, and now we are going down the road \$7,000,000,000 in debt. Just remember this, \$7,000,000,000 does not mean much, because we expect our children to pay that debt. But, we are going to ask for more taxes. Now, when we give you more taxes, then you ought to be happy in this country.

Choo-choo-choo! Here we come. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Now we are going to tell you ladies and gentlemen of America that we are going to have a draft. We want a draft so that we can get more people in the Army. You know, it did not work very well the last couple of years; we did not need it, but we are going to get closer to war, and as we get closer to war we are going to need the draft and we are going to spend more money to aid the Army. The bigger our Army the more the cost.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! Just remember, ladies and gentlemen of this country, what is happening in foreign countries. We have got to spend money to help all these foreign countries. They need it badly, and we do not care anything about taxes in this country. So, let us give them the money and give them all they want. That is the way we will make this country prosperous—by trying to aid them. We care nothing for debt.

Choo-choo-choo! There goes that train going down the track. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Communism in America. That is just something that the Republicans talk about. You know that it is just a red herring that they are trying to draw across the trail of efficient government.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! Little business. Little business is coming into its own now. We are going to help little business. Little business needs the money. The bankers will not lend them the money and we are going to give it to them. We care nothing for debt or taxes.

Who says we are going bankrupt? Only the Republicans.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! On the road down to socialism. As we come down the road to socialism and pump priming we are going to tell the people of this country that that is what we have to do. Choo-choo-choo! Have the Government run business. Stop that train, Mr. Conductor. This is America, and I want to tell the people that we will run the country for them. Be patient, America, we will take you all for a ride.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is a rather peculiar time in the history of our country for us to be descending to discourses on petty politics such as we have just had here. I think we ought to recognize that in times like these we have some serious problems on our hands, problems with which you and I are trying to grapple.

But I cannot help, as long as there have been some observations made on the floor, to recall that only last Saturday I paid a visit to the State of the gentleman who just preceded me in the well of the House. I made a speech at Philadelphia last Saturday. While I was there I took occasion to consult with some of the leading citizens of that area to find out what was happening in the State of Pennsylvania.

I found in one sense nothing new. I found the same old crowd that for years has been dominant in the politics of the State of Pennsylvania is still very much on top of the heap. I am referring, of course, to what is commonly known as the Grundy machine. Many years ago when I taught at the University of Pennsylvania the Grundy machine was on top of the heap. It still is. Anyone who has ever taken the trouble to study even in the most casual manner the politics of Pennsylvania and, for that matter, the politics of the United States, knows very well what the Grundy machine has meant. The Grundy machine has been an organization concerned only with the interests of one group of citizens. It has been concerned exclusively with the interests of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and the kind of legislation which the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association wants.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority floor leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Is it not true that Governor Duff has accused Grundy of controlling the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, and accused them in turn of controlling and owning the Republican Party and controlling the State? I would be interested to know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is a Duff man or a Grundy man.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am for a good, sound administration in the State of Pennsylvania, and we are going to have it. We are not going to ask anybody from the State of Wisconsin or Massachusetts to tell us how to run the State of Pennsylvania, because we get along up there and we always have. We are a hard-working people, industrious, honest, and conscientious.

Mr. Grundy is one of the citizens of this country who asked for labor to have jobs by having a high tariff, and I am with Mr. Grundy on that. I am against the reciprocal-trade agreements because they are going to wreck this country, throw labor out of employment, and close down industry.

If that is what you want, you are going to get it. The quicker you turn back, the better it will be.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. About all the gentleman from Pennsylvania said was that he is opposed to sin—but what does he stand for on the positive side?

Mr. BIEMILLER. While I was in Pennsylvania, I made an observation on the subject referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There is a very interesting internecine warfare going on in the Republican Party of Pennsylvania. The Governor of Pennsylvania, as correctly stated by the majority leader, has been out, really been out against the Grundy machine and has pointed out facts that many of us have known for a great many years—but which not many Republicans are willing to talk about. That is that the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and their allies in the power trust, through Joe Grundy, have been running the State of Pennsylvania. In the course of this very interesting internal fight, some interesting things have happened in the politics of the State of Pennsylvania. We have found, for example, that one self-styled Republican liberal who came originally from the Middle West, Mr. Harold Stassen, who is now president of the University of Pennsylvania, is obviously more concerned with using that high position as a sounding board for self-seeking politics than he is in trying to administer the affairs of the University of Pennsylvania because he is now in this campaign with everything he has. This alleged liberal, this self-styled liberal, is now lined up with the Grundy machine in this fight, a rather interesting transition for one who was prating during recent months of what a great white hope he was for liberalism in the Republican Party. Of course, we in the Middle West are not overly surprised for we have long known that Mr. Stassen is concerned primarily with just one project—the self-advancement of Harold Stassen. Evidently he is convinced the Grundy machine will win in Pennsylvania.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska Communication System, as authorized by act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims as authorized by law (28 U. S. C. 2672); \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) a cost per family unit in excess of \$28,000 for construction, including kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 334, line 20, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$2,877,920."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment sought to bring the construction appropriation for the Alaska Communication System to \$2,877,920 from the House committee allowance of \$1,000,000 represents construction of buildings for technical equipment in the amount of \$2,216,000 for radio transmitters, receivers, and the necessary power equipment for the operation of the equipment and construction of 28 sets of family quarters in the amount of \$661,920 to be used mainly for noncommissioned officers.

In the entire Alaska Communication System of 42 stations there is technical equipment valued at about \$3,000,000. It is imperative that this equipment which is now installed in the wartime buildings which are either tar-paper-covered shacks or quonset huts be replaced with new buildings as the old buildings have now deteriorated to a point where they are beyond economical repair.

The Department of the Army has recently advertised for bids for the construction of four types of family houses to be built at Fort Richardson, Alaska, and the type of construction and the size is reduced from the previous standards built in this area. The low bid for a single unit of the military construction, on the assumption that 400 would be built, was \$15,000. The unit cost at Anchorage for the Alaska Communication System program has been estimated at \$19,700 since the estimate is based on individual units rather than a block bid on the Army construction of 400 units. Since the funds in the appropriations bill for the construction program of the Alaska Communication System for family quarters are at distant points from Anchorage, such as Fairbanks, Big Delta, Cathedral Bluffs, Northway, Skagway, and Naknek, it is obvious that single units at these distant points will cost

more. The computed average price is \$23,640. Following is a short chart giving a break-down of the \$661,920 for family quarters sought by the amendment: *Estimated cost of ACS family housing for fiscal year 1951*

Bids were recently opened for 50 8-family row houses (400 units), at Fort Richardson. Based on low bid the total cost per family unit including furnished materials and cost of engineering, design, inspection, supervision, and administration is— \$15,000

For ACS duplexes add—

5 percent for individual heating— \$750

10 percent for size of program (1 to 8 units instead of 400)— 1,500

10 percent for more costly design (duplex 1-story instead of 8-family (2-story)— 1,500

Total— 18,750

Contingencies 5 percent— 938

Per unit cost at Anchorage— 19,688

Round figure— 19,700

Amount recommended based on above estimate for Anchorage and applying the construction factors for more remote locations:

Station	Factor	Unit cost	Number of units	Budget amount
Anchorage	1.0	\$19,700	8	\$157,600
Fairbanks	1.2	23,640	8	189,120
Big Delta	1.4	27,580	2	55,160
Cathedral Bluffs	1.6	31,520	2	63,040
Northway	1.6	31,520	2	63,040
Skagway	1.0	19,700	2	39,400
Naknek	1.2	23,640	4	94,560
Total			28	661,920
Average per unit				(23,640)

¹ Base.

The favorable bids on Fort Richardson resulted from a new design which incorporated reduced standards of construction from those of last year. The figures recommended for the ACS budget assume a similar reduction in standards for ACS houses.

It must be emphasized that the Alaska Communication System was provided \$2,159,548 in the 1949 fiscal year which permitted the building of some very modest family quarters. In the 1950 fiscal year, although many millions were appropriated in the military budget for quarters in Alaska, none was appropriated for the Alaska Communication System. Therefore, for the fiscal year 1951 this request of only \$661,920 for the construction of 28 family quarters is a very modest request considering the total requirement.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the people who staff the ACS are doing a grand job. They handle all communications for the Army, the Air Force, and some of the Navy communications and for the civilian population of Alaska. They are required to live at distant points, often under unfavorable circumstances. The ACS has been, by and large, the most valuable training ground we possess for Signal Corps personnel. The people who came out of the system during World War II were the backbone of the Signal Corps' expanding functions. Those people ought to be taken care of in respect to family dwellings, along with the other persons in the armed services in the Territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I would say that a study is being made by the Department of Defense, which has perhaps now been concluded, but the results of which have not yet been made to the committee. It is true they asked for \$3,000,000, and it is set forth quite explicitly on page 48 of the hearings, and detailed to some extent. The committee thought it was doing very well by this item in allowing \$1,000,000. There has been a state of confusion in the building business in Alaska, and it has been a very expensive proposition. Accordingly, the committee feels it has done the best it could under the circumstances, and the newness of the program, and we ask for a vote on the amendment and that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for surveys of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States; for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 76 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535); for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; for printing and binding and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, including such printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; \$187,678,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not au-

thorized by law: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed \$2,700,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756), and the act of August 14, 1946.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN:

Page 337, line 1, after the semicolon, insert the phrase "for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized."

Page 337, line 10, strike out "\$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$189,178,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to get into the bill language that would permit the Corps of Army Engineers to continue their planning program and to provide \$1,000,000 in planning money. The Bureau of the Budget recommended for rivers and harbors \$240,714,000. The bill before you provides only \$187,678,000, a reduction by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the amount of \$53,036,000. The amendment before you will provide only \$1,000,000 in planning money against the Budget's recommendations of \$2,000,000.

I shall offer another amendment under "Flood control, general," which, if adopted, would provide \$2,000,000 in planning money. Under "Flood control, general," the Bureau of the Budget recommended \$478,447,000. The bill before you provides only \$341,055,000, a reduction by the committee in this item of \$137,393,000. The amendment I shall offer under "Flood control, general," will provide for only \$2,000,000 in planning money against the Budget's recommendation of \$4,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, elimination of planning money for the fiscal year 1951 will

bring planning work to a standstill and prevent the preparation of plans and specifications for useful and necessary projects which should be started in the near future. To my way of thinking, it is false economy to eliminate planning money and hamstring the Corps of Army Engineers. I should like to direct to the committee's attention that in recent years the Bureau of the Budget has required strict limitation on new projects started, with the result that the Bureau's recommendations and estimates, defended by the chief of engineers, for the last three fiscal years, provide for 1949 only 19 new projects; 1950, only 5 new projects; 1951, no new projects.

The recommendation of the Budget that no new projects be started is a very drastic curtailment, but in addition to that curtailment, if we deprive the Corps of Army Engineers of planning money, we are going to paralyze and, to a large extent, destroy rivers and harbors and flood control development. I am of the opinion, and I believe the majority of the committee will concur, that the Corps of Army Engineers are doing a creditable job. Many things have happened in the past 2 years which, on the surface, appear to have been planned to embarrass the Corps of Army Engineers and to discredit them in the great job they are doing.

Those of you who have kept up with construction work of the Corps of Army Engineers know very well that projects of the civil works program which are now complete and in operation have already returned to the Nation about \$2.15 for every dollar expended. It would be nothing less than false economy, and certainly it would endanger the lives of our citizens and destroy their property to interrupt or defer progress on rivers and harbors and flood-control construction work.

Is it not true that we have billions of dollars in rivers and harbors and flood-control authorizations outstanding? Is it not also true that the Congress passed a flood-control bill only a few days ago in the amount of \$1,500,000,000? This bill passed the House by a vote of 210 for with only 137 against. What would be the purpose of passing a new rivers and harbors and flood-control bill authorizing additional expenditures if it is the purpose of the Congress to eliminate planning money and to paralyze the normal operations of the Corps of Army Engineers?

Mr. Chairman, we are all in favor of greater economy in all branches of our Federal Government. My record will indicate that I have worked to effect greater economy. I am on record as having voted against many appropriation bills, but there are certain public improvement expenditures that are absolutely necessary and these expenditures give us a large return on the investment. Rivers and harbors and flood-control work give us a very satisfactory return on our investment and protect the lives and property of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, it has been my privilege to cooperate with the chairman and all members of the committee.

In my own subcommittee I voted for certain reductions. On the floor of this House I opposed an amendment that had for its purpose to increase the appropriation bill in favor of a new program, but my amendment does not in any way start any new program. It merely provides for a very minimum of planning money for the Corps of Army Engineers and I am of the opinion, in the long run, if this amendment is adopted, it will save the taxpayers untold millions of dollars. Certainly if we permit the Corps of Army Engineers to disrupt their planning work and lose trained personnel, when the planning program is again started it will cost many additional millions of dollars to get the planning program back on a current basis. We experienced such a disruption in the President's freeze order of 1946 and it has been estimated that that order cost the taxpayers many millions of dollars.

I wish to direct to the attention of the committee that rivers and harbors and flood-control development are almost Nation-wide and not localized in any sense of the word.

I have a very high regard for every member of the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee. They have worked hard and untiringly to report out a good bill and I shall not complain too much about the unusual reduction made in this chapter. However, I certainly disagree with members of the committee when they attempt to paralyze and hamstring the Corps of Army Engineers by eliminating planning money. I hope that you support this amendment and also the amendment that I shall offer under "Flood control," generally because, in my opinion, to do so will save the taxpayers many millions of dollars in the long run, and prevent the destruction of one of the finest organizations in the Government, namely, the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment, as I understand, applies to plans or projects heretofore authorized and hereafter authorized.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. If it applies to projects hereafter authorized, it is subject to a point of order. I suggest to the gentleman that he make it apply to projects heretofore authorized so that he will have some basis for his argument.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There was no point of order made against it, and that language was carried by the committee. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a good suggestion, and I suggest that the language "or hereafter authorized" be eliminated from the gentleman's amendment, and then it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to eliminate the word "hereafter".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as now modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN:

On page 337, line 1, after the semicolon, insert the phrase "for the execution of detailed investigation and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized."

On page 337, line 10, strike out the figure "\$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$188,678,000."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. His amendment now will authorize what amount for planning?

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the Bureau of the Budget recommended \$2,000,000 for rivers and harbors, and I am asking that the committee approve only \$1,000,000. That is half of what the Bureau of the Budget requested.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman's amendment carry the sum of \$1,500,000?

Mr. PASSMAN. No; it is \$1,000,000. That is half of what the Bureau of the Budget requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his reservation on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; since the amendment has been changed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman says that he has increased the amount by how much?

Mr. PASSMAN. One million dollars.

Mr. RABAUT. According to the figures that we have received from the gentleman he increased it \$1,500,000. We are not conceding it, but we just want to know what the figure is that the gentleman is increasing this amount by.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wish to have the amendment read "an increase of \$1,000,000."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that the figure be corrected so that it will read \$188,678,000, and that will make the increase \$1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BROOKS. I object, Mr. Chairman. I think the full budget request for planning ought to be in the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, then the increase is how much?

Mr. PASSMAN. One million dollars is what I intended to ask for in the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. How can the gentleman intend to make it \$1,000,000 when he increases the figure from \$187,678,000 to \$189,178,000? That difference is \$1,500,000.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Passman amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct the figure in the amendment so that the increase will read \$1,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I am in favor of the budget amount or any amount that will reach toward the budget amount. I think the amount in this amendment is too low.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I suggest to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] that, so that his colleagues may try to accomplish his purpose, he offers an amendment to the amendment later, and let the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] submit his amendment as he intended.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN:

On page 337, line 10, strike out "\$187,678,000: Provided," and insert in lieu thereof "\$192,678,000: Provided, That of this appropriation, \$2,000,000 shall be available for the work of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway heretofore authorized by law (Public Law 525, 79th Cong.), and \$2,000,000 shall be available for construction of the Demopolis lock and dam in the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers project: Provided further."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish all Members would move around in front where they can see this map clearly, because I want to talk about a project that affects the entire Nation.

In the first place, we are increasing the appropriation for the Demopolis Dam, but we are holding it down to \$4,000,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. There is no question about both these projects being a part of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

I want to appeal to you today from the standpoint of national defense first. We cannot afford another Pearl Harbor.

We cannot afford to wait until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb, as happened at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

This project will cut the water distance between Mobile on the Gulf and the atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles. It will cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to Oak Ridge by anywhere from 50 to 75 percent. Remember, we have already delivered approximately 2,000,000 tons of material into Oak Ridge by barge. But if you take that material from the Gulf now, you have to fight the swift current of the Mississippi River for 869 miles, go up the Ohio River 47 miles, then up the Tennessee River 215 miles to reach the point where, by following this slack-water route, you would only travel 481 miles in slack water.

In other words, you go 1,131 miles out of the way, and every foot of it upstream.

Someone has said that we have been on this project for 100 years. That is true; but they never could build this project until the Pickwick Dam was built in 1938, because of the sand ridge between the Tombigbee and the Tennessee, where you would have had to have lifts going both ways, with no water supply at the summit. When that dam was built in 1938, raising that water level 54 feet at the mouth of Yellow Creek, the Army engineers came back and said that that entirely solved the problem. They said they could put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River and have all the water we would ever need.

Let me show you another thing. This is not only the missing link, in our program of national defense; but it is also the missing link in our program of internal waterway transportation, for the simple reason that it cuts the cost of transportation on a bargeload of 14,000 tons going into the Ohio River by more than \$22,000 on the fuel bill alone. We have 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River, 13 on the Monongahela, and 8 on the Allegheny. It gives us virtually a slack-water route for returning traffic all the way to Pittsburgh, Pa., Cincinnati and Wheeling, and all other points on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Missouri Rivers, and at the same time saves the swift current of the Mississippi River for downstream traffic. It does the same thing for the Great Lakes. It would like the lady from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] to pay particular attention, because I am coming to Cleveland. We have had more people appeal to us from Cleveland, Ohio, to develop this project, than I ever dreamed would enter this fight. It means a slack-water route all the way back from the Gulf to the Great Lakes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman be able to tell us how far it is from New Orleans to Mobile?

Mr. RANKIN. It is 156 miles along the intracoastal waterway that is protected by a string of islands and is slack-water every step of the way.

Going back to Cairo, it would cut the cost on a 14,000 barge load from the Gulf of Mexico to Cairo above \$20,000 on the fuel bill alone. That means that saving on every barge load that goes into

the Great Lakes up the Illinois River, or up the Mississippi River all the way to Minneapolis and St. Paul, or up the Missouri River.

Again let me call to your attention the fact that the iron-ore supply in America is being rapidly depleted, and unless something is done to find a source of iron ore, you are going to find your great industrial plants in the Middle West, in Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and all the other cities in that area seeking locations elsewhere. The iron-ore supply in that entire area is rapidly declining.

But they have discovered the greatest high-grade iron-ore deposit in the world in Venezuela. Let me read to you what someone has written in the interests of the steel producers of this great area. He says:

They have discovered a huge mountain extending upward 2,000 feet, 1 mile wide and 11 miles long. It is practically all high-grade iron ore, the richest and largest high-grade ore deposit in the history of the world.

These barges that go down the Mississippi River, when they come back not only can bring this iron ore from Venezuela, but they can bring back bauxite that the people of that area are using to manufacture aluminum. They can also bring back oil. One man wrote me that he was shipping 15,000 automobiles a month from Detroit down the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers. He said, "I want to bring back oil," which he can get right at the Demopolis field, and save him \$30,000 on one barge load.

But the way it is now, he said:

The swift current of the Mississippi River eats up my profit.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I wonder if the gentleman could supply us with the figures of traffic density on this river, caused by the development of the South American iron-ore fields.

Mr. RANKIN. With this development it will double, treble, and quadruple the traffic on the Mississippi River. The traffic will go counterclockwise down the Mississippi, across to Mobile, up through the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then downstream to Paducah and Cairo.

This traffic would move counterclockwise, go down the Mississippi, across to Mobile, back up through this slack-water route to the Tennessee and then downstream to Paducah and Cairo. When you get above St. Louis you have 26 locks and dams on the Mississippi between there and Minneapolis and St. Paul. You have seven locks and dams on the Illinois River, that provides a slack-water route into the Great Lakes. Yet that traffic is bottled up, simply for the want of this missing link in the greatest inland waterway system the world has ever seen.

If this project were in Europe it would have been developed long ago. If it were in Europe now, they would be developing it at the expense of the American taxpayers under the so-called Marshall plan.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi for the fine work he has done for years on this project. I believe that the Members of Congress are gradually becoming alive to the fact that this will be not only of benefit to the South but of benefit to the entire Nation as a defense project.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Alabama that it will extend its immediate benefits clear up to the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. It will extend its benefits to all of that entire western section of Pennsylvania, over all of the State of Ohio, over all of the States of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, North and South Dakota, and Montana. Nearly every one of those States will really enjoy at least as much, if not more, benefits from it than will the State of Mississippi.

I sincerely trust that the committee will accept this amendment and let us move forward to the development of the missing link in our inland waterway system, as well as the missing link in our national defense program.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for his fine presentation. I propose to support his amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska. I hope my amendment is adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the national defense is vitally involved in this project.

This project gives our Nation a short slack-water route.

And why is that important to the national defense?

It shortens by more than 800 miles the distance from the Gulf of Mexico to our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge.

It cuts the cost of transportation by 50 to 75 percent.

It gives us an additional outlet to the sea in time of emergency.

It gives us a connecting, highly important slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Ohio River, to the upper Mississippi, to the Missouri River, to the Great Lakes.

In this day of snorkel submarines, of guided missiles shot from submarines against our coastal cities, possibly with atomic warheads, how vital can a slack-water inland transportation network be?

Of course, we have no way of knowing, in time of peace.

But in time of war its importance can be incalculable.

As an example, I think of the terrible depletion, in the last war, of the Mesabi iron-ore range.

Two years ago the Armed Services Committee had a forecast from an industry leader that in the very near future our great Nation will be substantially dependent upon Brazil and other South American countries for high-grade iron ore.

Now, just how, in time of war, will we get that iron ore, if we have to have it?

That is the kind of defense question that has interested me in this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

I recall only too vividly our tragic experiences with German submarines in the last war.

Why, members of the committee, even the Caribbean became almost impassable.

Ships were being sunk, one after the other, right off New York Harbor.

And that was before the snorkel submarine.

That was before guided missiles.

That was before atomic energy.

I shudder to contemplate the next submarine war—with submarines fighting submarines—with homing devices guiding torpedoes—with submarines serving as carriers of long-range missiles guided by radio to their targets—missiles armed, possibly, with such terribly destructive warheads that it may well be that the future submarine will be able to devastate the coastal areas of the entire Nation.

The grief we had in the last war in trying to get our tankers, our coastal shipping, or Liberty ships through is all too vivid in my mind.

We missed only by an eyelash the losing of the war to the submarine.

And today, Russia has far more submarines—about six times as many—including the modern, deadly snorkel type, than Germany had in her possession at the outbreak of World War II.

Its potentialities in time of war are enormous.

To my way of thinking, with national defense our No. 1 requirement today, that fact must play an important role in the decision of the House on this project.

It will save vast amounts of transportation costs.

It permits the newly discovered, extremely rich iron ore deposits of Venezuela to be brought more cheaply—and, of much greater importance, far more safely—to our great steel centers such as Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Youngstown, Chicago, Detroit, and St. Louis.

I have checked into the feasibility of the project.

The Army Chief of Engineers terms the project not only possible but entirely feasible.

He reports that the construction of the Pickwick Dam in 1938 across the Tennessee River, just below the point where this project reaches the Tennessee, raised the water level at that point 54 feet.

And that event changed the entire completion of this project, which has had a long and troubled history.

For, theretofore, because of a sand ridge between the Tombigbee River and Tennessee River, it was impracticable to

consider the project. The geography of the situation required the construction of expensive locks.

Now, however, thanks to the Pickwick Dam, the Army engineers can assert—and have officially reported—that because this dam raised the water level 54 feet, the offending sand ridge can be cut through, the summit of the project can be put in the Tennessee River, and there will be ample water for its operation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to consider this project with greater sympathy than heretofore.

Its national defense implications are truly tremendous.

And, as in the case of great weapons of war, it is far too late to attempt to build such an enterprise once an emergency is upon us.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I am quite sure the gentleman is quoting General Wheeler.

Mr. VINSON. I am; the gentleman is right.

Mr. RANKIN. General Wheeler was Chief of the Army Engineers and was the Washington representative of the Army engineers when the survey of this project was made back in the 1930's. In my opinion he is one of the ablest men who have ever been Chief of the Army Engineers. He says this project is absolutely necessary for our national defense.

Mr. VINSON. There can be no doubt of that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that one reason given by the United States Steel Corp. for the recent increase in the price of steel was to procure capital to develop its resources in Venezuela. If they consider it necessary now to begin opening up that area, it is an indication to us that if we are to profit by it in time of national emergency we must provide a safe means of getting the raw material to the industrial areas.

Mr. VINSON. Why, of course. During World War II right out of New York Harbor ship after ship was sunk. How are you going to get this material into the industrial centers unless you adopt a measure of this kind and permit the ships to come through the Caribbean, then up the Warrior River, up the Tombigbee to the Ohio, and thence on up to Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, and that whole section of the country?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 4 years ago this project was authorized by a majority vote of both Houses but they said at that time, "Wait and let them finish the planning." The planning is now complete. We have spent \$858,000 on the planning of this project, and the plans are now complete, as General Pick said the other day.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee. I want to make a statement which I trust will not be taken personally by any Member. Because of what happened a year ago I will make a personal objection to the assignment of time from one Member to another, so those who want to speak on the amendment will be asked to speak in their own right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, is the gentleman's request limited to the amendment proposed by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] or to the original amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. To the amendments that are on the Clerk's desk and all amendments thereto.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan may not know it, but he cannot object to a Member yielding to another Member for an interruption.

Mr. RABAUT. I did not say that. That statement has not been made.

Mr. RANKIN. No; but this is an attempt to shut off debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, there are 20 Members standing who wish to be heard personally, and I do not think it is right to cut debate on an important subject like this; therefore, I am forced to object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members ought to know something about this, and I think I ought to call the attention of the members of the Committee to a few of the facts that relate to it.

The length of this waterway is 268 miles; 180 on the Tombigbee River, 49 from Maceys Creek to Yellow Creek, and 39 down Yellow Creek into the Tennessee. That is just about the same distance as the distance from Albany to Buffalo. There we built the enlarged Erie Barge Canal of just about this same size, but with only just a few locks, and 40 years ago, with costs much lower than now; the cost of that construction was \$400,000,000.

Let me tell you this, in arriving at estimates which totaled \$170,000,000 a year ago, the engineers put in locks and dams at from \$3,350,000 to \$8,000,000 over all. Let me say to you that single locks and dams, with the capacity to carry tows that would be required here, are set up as costing \$20,000,000, and I have got one of those right in front of me. Many of them up through the Ohio

and the Mississippi, in the upper reaches, cost \$15,000,000, and the cost of just the 18 locks and dams, in my judgment—and I am basing that on my experience with the engineers and the things that they have done—would run \$270,000,000.

The excavation is enormous. Why, a lot of that river is 6 feet wide and 6 inches to 3 feet deep. The width of the waterway is to be not less than 170 feet at the bottom of the channel. With respect to the 49 miles between Maceys Creek and Yellow Creek there is no water at all. The entire distance must be excavated, necessitating the removal of 88,000,000 yards of dirt. The elevation is 170 feet from the water level, which means excavating 170 feet deep. The width of this excavation will flare out about 2,000 feet in order to provide protection against soil erosion. It is, of course, impossible for anybody to estimate what it might ultimately come to; \$350,000,000 would be a low estimate of what it would run.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. General Pick testified the other day that the limit would be \$189,000,000.

Mr. TABER. But I have given you the details, and the gentleman will realize, if he studies General Pick's operations, that he runs his figures up. Why, on one dam on the Missouri River he ran it up from \$75,000,000 to \$225,000,000. Oh, he is a good man to run the figures up. He does not run them up, though, until after he gets something started. I think we ought to understand that first. The figures that I gave you of from \$350,000,000 to \$400,000,000 are low. If you get into this project you will get in it away beyond \$400,000,000 before you are through.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us the dates the calculations were made as to the estimates on which he says the Chief of the Corps of Engineers was in error, so the record can be kept straight?

Mr. TABER. It is very hard to go by that, because the Corps of Engineers redesign a project after construction is started on it, and they enlarge on it so that it costs a great deal more. One of those items was raised like that between 1943 and 1944 and the present time. Others have been raised enormous amounts in 1 year. They have doubled the cost of one proposed project up there this year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman mean the calculations were made in 1 year, or the original estimates—

Mr. TABER. The original estimates sometimes are raised on the basis of increased size of the project. Sometimes they are raised because they had given us very low figures to start with. You cannot tell anything about the figures they give you. That is our experience, and it has been a very distressing experience, one that is exceedingly difficult for anyone to put up with.

Let me show you another thing. It is 156 miles from New Orleans to Mobile. It is 268 miles up here. You have 18 blocks to go through with great big tows. The length of time is enormous. You cannot make speed in that way.

As to this iron-ore business, let me tell you how that is working. The United States Steel Co. has wharves set up in Baltimore and Philadelphia to take the ore that comes from their new project in Venezuela. That is the farthest advanced of all the South American ore projects. They have gone so far as to spend millions of dollars on those projects. If they had been figuring on bringing that ore into Mobile, you would have heard a lot more about that, and you would have heard about schemes for deepening the harbor and all that sort of thing. But they can haul that ore more cheaply in the large boats up to Baltimore and Philadelphia and thence by rail than they can transship it and haul it by barge up the Mississippi, and they can do it much more quickly.

Let no one get the idea this is going to save a lot of money, or that it is a major item of defense. It is one of those things that have been dreamed up by certain people. I do not object to their having the dream, but I hate to see the United States Treasury embark on a project that I cannot see a chance in the world of working out for less than \$350,000,000 to \$400,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will reject this proposal.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to read \$188,678,000 rather than the figure previously submitted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, then what would the effect be?

Mr. PASSMAN. It would increase rivers and harbors by only \$1,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I want to say I objected originally to the change because I favor the higher figure as recommended in the budget. I withdraw my objection at the present time because I have presented an amendment at the Clerk's desk which will insert the full budget amount.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, in the event the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Louisiana is granted, what then would be permitted by way of amendment to the gentleman's amendment in view of the fact that a substitute amendment has been offered?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment may be offered to the Passman amendment.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: Page 337, line 1 after the semicolon, insert the phrase "for the execution of detailed

investigation and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized."

Page 337, line 10, strike out the figure "\$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$188,678,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that since my amendment is a substitute amendment, I may add a similar amount to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: On page 337, line 4, strike out "\$187,678,000: Provided", and insert in lieu thereof "\$192,178,000: Provided, That of this appropriation \$2,000,000 shall be available for the work of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway heretofore authorized by law (Public Law 525, Seventy-ninth Congress), and \$2,000,000 shall be available for construction of the Demopolis Dock and Dam in the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers project: Provided further,".

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] or an amendment to the substitute?

Mr. BROOKS. I have an amendment to each of those amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Which amendment does the gentleman desire to offer?

Mr. BROOKS. I want to offer both amendments. I should like to be recognized on either amendment. I will now offer the amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS as an amendment to the substitute: Strike out "\$192,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$193,678,000."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment to the substitute and I have an amendment to the Passman amendment as originally offered. My purpose in both instances is to ask that the committee provide the budget figure for planning for this purpose which is \$2,000,000. For years we have been appearing before the Committee on Appropriations and asking for money for rivers and harbors projects.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RABAUT. What is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. It is to provide for the budget amount for this particular item. That would be \$2,000,000.

Mr. RABAUT. How much is the full amount?

Mr. BROOKS. The additional amount would be \$2,000,000. As I said, for years we have been going before the Committee on Appropriations speaking for this type of project and we have been talking

with them, and almost the first question that comes from the Appropriation Subcommittee in charge of this work is, Did the Budget recommend that figure? You answer "No," and you are out of court, so to speak.

In this instance the Budget did recommend \$2,000,000 for this particular item. I thought it was a small figure for planning purposes.

This item, plus the one for flood control, totals \$6,000,000 for planning. That is all the money that the Budget recommended for planning purposes to this particular civil-functions bill; yet, in spite of that fact, every cent of it was stricken out when the bill came to the floor of the House of Representatives.

It is my purpose today to present to you the proposition of restoring to this bill the amount the budget recommended for planning purposes in the rivers and harbors and flood-control provisions of the act.

Just let me say this: There is no single small item—and in a bill of over \$29,000,000,000, an item of \$6,000,000 is a small item, comparatively speaking—there is no small item that will mean so much to so many Members in so many scattered areas of the United States as will the restoration of planning money in this particular bill. I think in both rivers and harbors and flood control, the restoration of planning means some eighty-odd projects throughout the United States will continue in a planning stage and at a cost of a total of \$6,000,000, and in this particular phase of the bill for rivers and harbors at a cost of \$2,000,000. If that amount is restored, plans on these projects can go ahead. As some of my colleagues have told you, we have trained workers in this particular work. They have been devoting their lives to the planning of river and harbor and flood-control purposes. Those people will be released and with them will go their training. The continuity of the work will be interrupted. If we do not restore the planning money, our action will mark the beginning of the end of flood-control and rivers and harbors work until we can restore planning. It is extremely important to the people of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. We have no objection to the increase of this planning money.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very thankful for the kind support of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand correctly that the amendment proposed here is that our colleague from Louisiana, a member of the committee [Mr. PASSMAN], proposes an amendment to provide \$1,000,000 for planning, and the gentleman's amendment would increase that amount to the total recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for planning purposes?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. On all rivers and harbors and flood control?

Mr. BROOKS. No; not flood control. It is simply rivers and harbors. This is the rivers and harbors phase of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman's amendment, as I understand, is to increase the \$1,000,000 proposed by his colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to a total of \$2,000,000?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; and for the reason that the budget recommended \$2,000,000. I want to exhort my friends on the subcommittee who year after year have called on us to support the budget, to come forward and support the budget in this little phase of this important matter.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to ask if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] was adopted, how would the \$1,000,000 be utilized for this project if it requires \$2,000,000 to do the work that the Army engineers say they need?

Mr. BROOKS. It puzzles me very much indeed—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have been puzzled about that. The amount here is so small, and I can say it is needed, if a program of planning is worthy of being carried on without interruption. It is certainly worthy of the amount the budget recommended. If we do not allow that amount it will cause considerable confusion, for the great difficulty in equitably dividing a small amount.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. As I understand the amendment of the gentleman now pending, it is offered as a substitute.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. I may also say that I also have present an amendment to the Rankin substitute.

Mr. PICKETT. But the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to make the amount as it is in the Rankin substitute?

Mr. BROOKS. Right.

Mr. PICKETT. Which would result in a total increase in the amount of money of some \$6,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; the difference there would be simply \$1,000,000 more for rivers and harbors planning—

Mr. PICKETT. What the gentleman really wants to do is to increase the amount for planning; that is what the gentleman is seeking.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct; I want to stand by the budget recommendation of \$2,000,000.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Passman amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT as an amendment to the Passman amendment: Strike out "\$188,678,000" and insert "\$189,678,000."

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, the situation is that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] offered an amendment to this bill to put in \$1,000,000 of planning money for rivers and harbors projects. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] offered a substitute which proposes to appropriate money to prosecute the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and allow some planning money. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who just preceded me, has offered an amendment to the Rankin substitute in which he seeks \$2,000,000 for planning money. If you adopt that amendment you will be putting \$2,000,000 of planning money in the Rankin substitute, together with money to further construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. In just a moment.

My amendment is to the Passman amendment. Bear in mind that the Passman amendment seeks to put \$1,000,000 for planning in the bill. If my amendment to the Passman amendment is adopted, and the Passman amendment as amended is adopted, you would have \$2,000,000 for rivers and harbors and planning, the same sum of money approved by the Bureau of the Budget. That is the sum of money that has been appropriated by this Congress annually for the past several years for planning purposes in rivers and harbors construction.

Let me say there is not a single rivers and harbors or flood-control project now under construction in my district; there is not a single one now in course of planning that has been authorized that will be constructed in my district. But I do believe in all sincerity that unless you have funds to carry on an adequate coordinated planning program for rivers and harbors and flood-control work that you are going to find the day come when you have no backlog of those things to be done when it is necessary to do them.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very glad the gentleman has offered his amendment. I had no objection to planning; my objection to the Passman amendment was that the amount for planning was being reduced. I am going to be very happy to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PICKETT. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman in support of my amendment. If you favor the Tennessee-Tombigbee proposal for construction then, of course, you would want to vote for it, but the situation is such that if you do not favor appropriation for construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee and you do favor the appropriation of \$2,000,000 by the current bill for planning rivers and harbors work for the next fiscal year, you can still vote against the Rankin substitute; vote for the Pick-

ett amendment to the Passman amendment, adopt the Pickett amendment, then adopt the Passman amendment as amended, and you will have \$2,000,000 in planning funds for rivers and harbors in the next fiscal year.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that I am heartily in favor of allowing \$2,000,000 additional for planning. It has been demonstrated in the past that this money has always been well spent; it has been informative to the Members of the Congress so that they know how work on these projects is proceeding and how to appropriate. So I hope the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] will be adopted.

There has been a tendency in some quarters to attempt to belittle the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, but let me remind you that this project has the approval of the Corps of Engineers. There is no bureau in the Federal Government which is more constantly praised for its objective manner in looking into these projects. So keep in mind this project has been approved by the engineers; keep in mind the sum asked for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. That Bureau knows something about how to spend the taxpayers' money. It has examined into this thing, the Corps of Engineers has examined into this thing, so why should we come up here with only a few hours' consideration, even less than a few hours' consideration, and toss out the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget? This project is going to be built, it is going to be finished, and if it is not done this year it will be done ultimately and within the next very few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have had an amendment at the Clerk's desk for several days, waiting to reach this section. My amendment increases the

amount in the Passman amendment and the Pickett amendment \$1,000,000. What is the status of my amendment at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. Is it intended as an amendment to the Passman amendment?

Mr. FALLON. My amendment goes to the original sum, but subsequent amendments have been offered which puts my amendment in the third degree so that I cannot offer it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman cannot offer his amendment until the pending amendments are disposed of.

Mr. FALLON. If the pending amendment is adopted, what position is my amendment in then?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the gentleman will bear in mind that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has offered an amendment; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] offered a substitute for that amendment, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] offered an amendment to the substitute. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] offered an amendment to the Passman amendment. Those four are all we can have pending at one time. Of course, if the gentleman has in mind desiring to offer an amendment to the Passman amendment after the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment is disposed of, and if it should not be adopted, then the gentleman could offer his amendment as an amendment to the Passman amendment, but if the Pickett amendment to the amendment is adopted, he could not offer it then.

Mr. FALLON. My amendment has been on the desk for 2 days, and I just could not get recognition, and I am ruled out on a parliamentary situation from getting my amendment in.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair would have been delighted to recognize the gentleman, but he just cannot recognize everybody at the same time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the gentleman may make a statement respecting the amendment he proposes to offer under his allotment of time, and that it can be read for the information of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is on the list and he may use that time to explain the amendment. He may also have the amendment read for the information of the House, if he desires.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON: On page 337, line 10, strike out "\$187,678,000" and insert "\$1,300,000 additional."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer two amendments to H. R. 7786.

On page 337, line 10, strike out "\$187,678,000" and insert "\$187,978,000."

On page 337, line 13, after the word "law", insert "Provided further, That of the amount herein appropriated \$800,000 shall be expended on the improvement of Baltimore Harbor, Md." These amendments both pertain to the same subject matter, to increase the appropriation allocated to the port of Baltimore from the present \$500,000, which the Appropriations Committee approved, to \$800,000.

President Truman, in making his recommendations, recognized the importance of this item and suggested a sum of not less than \$800,000 and the Bureau of the Budget approved this amount as being the minimum for the continuation of the deepening of the main channel. However, the House Appropriation Committee reduced the amount of \$500,000 without, I am sure, recognizing the damage that would be done to the project.

The \$800,000 figure recommended by President Truman and his budget aides is actually \$200,000 short of the sum urged by those with an intimate and expert knowledge of the channel problems. In January of this year, I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and in a detailed statement asked the members to authorize \$1,000,000 for continuation of the deepening of the main harbor channel to 39 feet as essential to the expected large volume of foreign iron ore through the port. I pointed out that shipping and related activities which provide employment for some 40,000 persons result in the inflow of some \$200,000,000 annually into the port's economic system, and generally affects every other business in the area and the entire economy of the United States. All of the dredging which has been planned for the coming year is required in a general channel deepening and widening program given Federal approval in the Seventy-ninth Congress which is now Public Law No. 14. The \$1,000,000 figure is vitally necessary in order to keep dredging work going throughout the 12 months of the year. Further reduction of \$300,000 by the committee cuts the needed sum in half. It will delay the completion of the work and the usefulness of the port. It is, in fact, a wasteful economy.

In the past 8 months Baltimore's position in the economic lifestream of the country has increased vastly in importance. I am sure you are all acquainted with the huge import ore movement announced for the immediate future. Baltimore has been selected by major steel companies of the country as the point of entrance for the bulk of this import ore. The announced plans of these firms include the use of ships of substantially greater tonnage than our present channels can accommodate. On different occasions ore ships going to Bethlehem Steel from Venezuela, Chile, and Africa dragged the Chesapeake Bay bottom because the channel was not deep enough. With Baltimore now becoming the ore-importing center of the United States it is more important than ever to accommodate huge ore carriers, tankers, and freighters as far as the inner harbor if the port is to be utilized to the fullest extent.

It is a recognized fact among port authorities that the potential flow of import iron ore will give Baltimore the position of the leading tonnage port of the United States if we have the channel and facilities to accommodate the huge volume that is expected to flow into the country within the next few years. Expansion of existing facilities for the handling of iron ore is already under way, particularly the new projects of the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Western Maryland and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroads, which run into millions, with private companies making substantial investments in preparation for this vastly increased inflow of iron ore. This is being done on the assurance that the Federal Government will carry through its portion of the program by speedily completing the much-needed 39-foot channel. Though these facilities are being built, failure to speedily complete the main channel would be a major obstacle, for no substantial amount of iron ore can be received. Without the proper approach to the port, we can expect large portions of this ore will be lost to this country.

Conservative estimates by responsible industrialists, transportation officials, and others indicate that the importation of iron ore at Baltimore should increase from its present rate of about 2,000,000 tons per year to approximately 10,000,000 tons per year in the immediate future. Only a fraction of this iron ore will be consumed at Baltimore. The major portion of it is destined for the inland mills in Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland, and Ohio Valley vicinities and to points even further west where the greatest steel producing center in the world is located.

It hardly needs to be emphasized here, that upon steel depends the economy of our country and steel production definitely depends on the availability of iron ore. This is not just a local project but very definitely one that will have far-reaching effects on great sections of our country and on the over-all economy of the Nation.

The importance of Baltimore to the West as a major outlet for grain, livestock, coal, iron, lumber, and many other products in which the shippers of the Western States are greatly interested should not be overlooked. Baltimore serves as a gateway for the agricultural and commercial products of the inland East and the Mid-West. It is through this gateway that raw materials vital to our industrial life enter the country and the products of our fields and factories flow to foreign markets.

The Appropriation Committee apparently did not accept my factual statement, or in an economical mood, decided to reduce the sum without taking into account the importance of the port of Baltimore in peace and war, now, and for all our future time.

I cannot stress too strongly the need for intelligent spending and intelligent economy. I personally have supported and worked to accomplish economy in Government. However, there is such a thing as being penny wise and pound foolish and, in my opinion, the \$300,000 reduction could not have been consid-

ered by the committee with full knowledge of the results that must follow in the crippling of the Government's work in connection with the deepening of this channel. This is not a matter of politics, nor city, county, or State importance. It is presently a matter of commercial national interest and could very well become one of national safety.

Let me point out also, should the cold war develop into a fighting war, which is not impossible nor too improbable, the port of Baltimore might conceivably be the terminus of the lifeline of our Nation.

Repeating what I said before the committee, "What affects the port of Baltimore affects the world and in this case, specifically, the entire economy of the United States," is not a theory but a fact and the sum of \$500,000, which has been approved by the committee, when compared to allocations of smaller port developments, is not reasonable nor practicable and should be increased at least to \$800,000. This \$800,000 was recommended in the President's budget and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and should be properly restored. Even this sum should be supplemented to the full \$1,000,000 which was arrived at as a result of careful planning. Work of this kind cannot be done overnight and should a national emergency arise, it will be the responsibility of this Congress if our ports are unable to properly function.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I direct my thought to the amendment my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has at the desk which we hope will be voted upon. This amendment is directed to obtaining \$300,000 additional for the great harbor of Baltimore.

The city of Baltimore is among the first three ports of the United States. It has been second for some time, and for several months last year was first, but in ratio of the amount of money spent to the tonnage going into that harbor, it has in no way been receiving a just allocation of the money directed to rivers and harbors.

There are approximately 40 miles of shorelines, most of which border upon the district I represent, with vast berthing facilities, and industrial plants among the leaders of the country, airplane plants and steel plants that are vital to the economy of America. When river and harbor projects are directed to commerce, the basic justification for Federal river and harbor projects, and with Baltimore the center of commerce, the spending of this additional money, which will only permit a 65-percent improvement, is well justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my appeal to that of my colleague from Maryland, in urging that the appropriation for the civil functions, Department of the Army, the rivers and harbors section, be increased to provide \$800,000 for the Baltimore Harbor

and channels, instead of the \$500,000 in the appropriation bill.

Most of this money would be used for deepening the channels of the Baltimore Harbor. This work has been going on for several years and the appropriation now requested would permit work on the extension of this project. So far, the amount allotted each year has enabled the engineers to go ahead with the work for several months only, and then it is discontinued until the appropriation for the next fiscal year is granted. With the amount requested by my colleague, the project would be about 65 percent complete.

For the past few years Baltimore has been the second highest port in the country in volume of foreign commerce handled and for several months last year was the leading import tonnage port of the United States. It is fast becoming the Nation's largest and most important port. There are 45.6 usable miles of water front comprising the harbor, and three-fifths of this has been developed. There are 40 miles of berthing space with 290 piers. The harbor provides warehouse facilities with storage space of 2,858,590 square feet; three huge grain elevators capable of delivering a total of 4,250,000 bushels of grain in 10 hours; rail yards capable of storing 4,500 freight cars; coal piers capable of loading 97,000 tons of coal in 10 hours. In addition, there are 14 shipbuilding and repair yards along the water front.

About 140,000 Baltimoreans are supported by the port; that is, they are the families of men and women directly engaged in the port's activities and those whose businesses are patronized by shippers and sailors.

Since water transportation is the cheapest form of transportation, Baltimore holds great interest for shippers of foreign freight, because its port brings ocean freighters farther inland than any other port on the east coast.

A very large percentage of the merchandise sent abroad under the European relief program passes through the port of Baltimore.

Recently a large expansion program was announced by the Bethlehem Steel Co., which includes an additional \$30,000,000 program for its Sparrows Point plant. They now import between four and five million tons of iron ore into Baltimore annually and expect to increase this amount when their expansion program is completed.

The United States Steel Corp. recently announced that Baltimore will be one of the principal ports of entry for its importation of iron ore from its recently developed fields in Venezuela.

The Republic Steel Corp. plans to import 1,000,000 tons of ore annually through the port from Liberian deposits.

A new pier is now under construction for the exclusive handling of ore, and this, with the expansion of existing facilities and the increased imports, is expected to make Baltimore the No. 1 port of the country.

In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Monday, Secretary of the Interior Chapman said that today the steel industry must look to foreign raw-material sources because do-

mestic iron-ore supplies are approaching depletion, and this may make necessary the restricted steel production in the foreseeable future. He emphasized that lack of domestic ore ties in with the need for, among other things, the choosing of sites along the Atlantic seaboard at such spots as Sparrows Point, Md., and eastern Pennsylvania for new mills required to meet the Nation's needs. And these places were specifically mentioned as being accessible to ocean shipping.

An adequate supply of raw materials for the steel industry could mean the difference between victory and defeat in an emergency. Therefore, the work on the deepening of the channel in the Baltimore Harbor becomes of even greater importance.

A glance at the House report on the bill will show that a number of ports far smaller in size and in amount of tonnage handled have been allotted much larger amounts than Baltimore.

While the port of Baltimore and its activities are indispensable to the economic life of the city, I urge the adoption of this amendment, because the completion of the work on the harbor is of vital importance to the welfare and safety of the entire Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BOLTON).

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am naturally interested in the port of Baltimore because I represent a large section of the city, and any improvement in the harbor or port facilities is sure to benefit some of my constituents. But much more important than the personal equation is the vital necessity of widening and deepening of the channel from the seacoast to Baltimore in order that deep draught ships may have ready ingress and egress to the port in time of war. This is especially important when we realize that we do not have enough iron in this country to supply the demand in time of emergency and that Baltimore is the gateway from the sea to the inland steel industries around Wheeling, West Virginia, Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and other inland steel centers.

I do not consider the harbor work contemplated in this appropriation as a local project but rather as a part of our great national defense program.

As one of America's chief gateways to the world, our port has always functioned for the Nation as a whole. Baltimore's pride in its shipping and its men of the sea has always been tempered by this feeling of national responsibility. In peace and in war it has responded promptly to the country's need.

You may well ask, why Baltimore? What peculiarity does this port have that would make it the choice as the chief entrance point for the importation of iron ore? The answer to these questions is based on irrefutable facts. Many of the large steel manufacturing concerns basically concerned with the economies of this situation have stated that they intend to use the port of Baltimore for the importation of their ore. Beyond this lies the fact that Baltimore enjoys a unique geographical position among United States ports and is situated only

313 rail miles from the great iron and steel center of Pittsburgh. Philadelphia, the next closest port, is 360 miles from Pittsburgh, while New York is 426 miles from this steel metropolis in western Pennsylvania. Youngstown, Ohio, another great producer of iron and steel, lies 378 rail miles from Baltimore while it is 424 miles from Philadelphia and 500 miles from New York. This substantial rail advantage in favor of the port of Baltimore prevails as far west as Chicago with its huge lake-side mills stretched along the shore of Lake Michigan to Gary, Ind. Chicago is 767 rail miles from Baltimore as compared with 814 to Philadelphia and 890 to New York.

In view of these shorter rail distances and the fact that freight rates are based on the mileage haul clearly explains the choice of Baltimore as the major entrance point for such a heavy and bulky commodity as iron ore where transportation costs will form a major portion of the over-all cost of this product vital to steel manufacture.

We have bulk cargo piers for the transshipping of grain in bulk, which are owned and operated by the three trunk line railroad companies serving the port of Baltimore. The average capacity of the three grain elevators in Baltimore average 334,000 tons each. The shiploading capacity per hour is about 1500 tons. In 1945 1,886,000 tons of grain were handled by the port of Baltimore. Since that time shipments of grain abroad have decreased.

The coal tipples, like the grain elevators, are owned and operated by the three trunk line railroads. Coal is delivered at the rate of 2,000 to 2,500 tons per hour. The Pennsylvania Railroad's coal pier has three movable coal towers which are capable of loading a vessel at the rate of 800 tons per hour.

The Western Maryland Railway Co. delivers coal to vessels at the rate of 3,500 tons per hour.

The average daily rate of all coal tipples is 6,500 tons per hour. In 1947, 11,491,170 tons of coal passed through the port of Baltimore.

Oil-handling facilities are available at 11 piers operated by the leading oil companies. All petroleum products are brought in, in bulk tankers from the Gulf coast and the Caribbean, except Gulf Oil Corp., which barges its oil from Philadelphia, and the Sinclair Oil Co., which has a pipe-line connection from Philadelphia. The total storage capacity of all oil installations in Baltimore is 4,900,000 barrels or about 735,000 tons. The receipts of petroleum products from 1936-45 averaged 3,875,000 tons per annum.

Several piers and wharves in Baltimore have loading equipment for handling ore, iron, and other bulk commodities. These facilities are owned and operated by the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Western Maryland Railway, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Canton Railroad Co. The Bethlehem Steel Co. ore-receiving dock is 11,200 feet long. The depth of the water alongside is 35 feet. Ore-loading capacity of the dock is 2,600 tons per hour. This facility is purely for the local steel plant supply and is being worked to capacity.

The Western Maryland Railway ore pier is 832 feet long and 66 feet wide and the depth of the water alongside is 35 feet. It is equipped with one 9-ton electric crane and with two boxcar loaders, each with a capacity of 300 tons per hour.

The Pennsylvania Railroad pier is 1,200 feet long and 64 feet wide. On the west side of the pier the depth of the water alongside is 30 feet all the way and on the east side the water varies from 14 to 30 feet depth. The pier is equipped with an electrically operated conveyor capable of 675 tons capacity per hour.

The Canton Railroad pier is 1,250 long and 80 feet wide. It is equipped with two 35-ton traveling-bridge cranes handling from 400 to 500 tons per hour.

Concrete bins with a capacity of 10,000 tons for storage are available for storage of ore or other bulk commodities at the inshore end of the pier.

The Copper Works pier on Clinton Street, near the foot of Holabird Avenue, is equipped with one 15-ton steam-locomotive crane. This is an exclusive plant facility for the American Smelting & Refining Co.

There are several other piers in the port operated by local industries. The city of Baltimore owns a large pier which is leased by the National Gypsum Co., and is equipped to receive gypsum ore. The Mutual Chemical Co. handles chrome ore on its pier. The General Chemical Co. handles sulfur ore and the Davison Co. handles phosphorus rock. There are 30 feet of water alongside the Gypsum and Davison Chemical piers and 24 feet at the Mutual Chemical pier.

In 1948 the imports of ores and metals were 6,341,069 tons, the highest in Baltimore history.

More numerous and, from the standpoint of commerce, equally important are the industrial and commercial piers in Baltimore. Their size and adequacy varies with the needs of the particular company involved.

We also have a number of suitable sites for additional ore terminals in Baltimore and the Port Development Commission of the city of Baltimore is in a position to finance the construction of an ore terminal in the event private capital for such an undertaking is not available.

While I was a member of the Maryland State Senate I heard one of the officials of the Bethlehem Steel Co. testify before a committee that we did not have enough iron ore in this country to carry on another war. God forbid that we may ever have another war, but if war should come, then surely we could not wait to dredge the harbor so that ships drawing 37 feet of water could unload their cargo on the docks in Baltimore for shipment to Pittsburgh and the other large steel producing localities throughout the Middle West.

Under the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, it was provided that a uniform main channel of 39 feet depth from the ocean be dredged through York Spit Section and Craighill entrance to Fort McHenry, as well as other projects vital to the safe usage and continued growth of the port of Baltimore. The total estimated cost for the harbor and

channel improvements is \$10,400,000. Up to the present time there has been allocated \$6,176,400. Last year in spite of urgent recommendations of the Baltimore district engineer and General Feringer, the then Chief of Army Engineers, the allocation for this main ship artery and related harbor work was reduced to \$650,000. This work, which was begun in June 1947, is now 65 percent completed. The allotted funds proposed for the fiscal year 1951 amounted to \$800,000. The additional funds required to complete the main channel to a depth of 39 feet to Fort McHenry are \$2,300,000. Baltimore Harbor interests are enthusiastically recommending an expenditure of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. The Bureau of the Budget approved \$800,000, but the House Committee on Appropriations has reduced the amount to \$500,000.

This is not a local project. Baltimore serves as a gateway for the agricultural and commercial products of the inland East and Midwest. It is through this gateway that raw materials vital to our industrial life enter the country, and the products of our fields and factories flow into foreign markets.

Tentative plans to use this port at the head of the Chesapeake Bay as a main entrance for foreign iron ore have solidified. Expansion of existing facilities for the handling of iron ore is already under way. Other facilities are far beyond the planning stage and are expected to be under construction within the next few months. Conservative estimates by responsible industrialists, transportation officials, and others indicate that the importation of iron ore at Baltimore could jump from its present rate of about 2,000,000 tons per year to approximately 10,000,000 tons per year in the near future. Only a fraction of this iron ore will be consumed in Baltimore. The major portion of it is destined for the inland mills in Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland, and Ohio Valley vicinities and to points even further west where the greatest steel producing center in the world is located.

The Western Maryland Railway has already expended substantial sums in lengthening its ore pier at Baltimore. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is expected to complete a new ore terminal in Baltimore in 1951 at a cost in excess of \$5,000,000; and while private companies are making substantial investments in preparation for the vastly increased inflow of iron ore, they are doing so with the firm belief that the Federal Government will carry through its portion of the program by speedily completing the much-needed 39-foot channel in the port of Baltimore. That substantial expenditure of private funds for dredging to meet the channel will be made, goes without saying; but to assure the full utilization of the facilities now under construction or planned for the immediate future, the main ship channel is a project of first priority.

The deepening of the main channel to 39 feet is required because the present depth has caused navigational difficulties and costly delays to deep-draught vessels. These difficulties will continue

until completion of the deepening of the entire main channel is accomplished.

At the present time, vessels carrying the bulk of ores to the port of Baltimore use the Sparrows Point cut-off which lies some distance outside Baltimore Harbor proper. The new ships engaged in this ore movement are rated at 24,000 tons and when laden draw 37 feet of water. To assure the safe passage of these carriers, the Bethlehem Steel interests in Sparrows Point are undertaking privately additional dredging off the cut-off to provide needed clearance for these huge vessels.

I cannot resist the opportunity at this time to add a word about the importance of this improvement to the people of Baltimore who depend upon the port activities for a living. More than 5,000 ships enter Baltimore Harbor every year, carrying close to 50,000,000 tons of cargo valued at about \$1,000,000,000. Forty-two thousand people earn their livelihood from operation of the port of Baltimore. This figure is exclusive of waterfront industries. Of the total, 30,000 can be assigned to ship repair and shipbuilding yards; 7,000 to the stevedore group, and 5,000 to miscellaneous categories such as railroad terminals, chandlers, shipcellers, tugboats, lighters, pilots, ship servicing, and so forth. Keeping those people in jobs is of real importance to the people of Baltimore, and keeping the port open and in such repair that all types of ocean-going vessels may readily reach the port in time of emergency is of paramount importance to our Nation's future security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

It is a pretty well acclaimed adage that it is not a good practice to place all of one's eggs in one basket.

The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] should be supported by every Member of the Congress who is really interested in rounding out a nearly perfect peace and wartime transportation program for our Nation.

In this day and age and in these troubled times, we cannot afford to turn thumbs down any more on the immediate development of this most vital project.

Its sponsor is today manifesting the same uncanny legislative wisdom which he showed in the House of Representatives when he fought so fearlessly and valiantly for the Tennessee Valley Authority which enabled us to win World War II and without which the atom bomb would most probably never have been developed.

All modes of transportation in our land should be developed to the largest measure. We need railway, bus, air, and water transportation if our country's future safety and potential progress is to become a reality.

It comes with pretty poor grace for any of these modes of transportation to attempt to hamstring or thwart the de-

velopment of another vital mode of transportation, as has been suggested was the fact on many occasions when this very proper improvement has been discussed in this House of Representatives.

All modes of transportation should work together toward doing the greatest good for the United States of America, instead of trying to scuttle the efforts of some other mode of transportation.

I was elected to this Congress to work in the best interests of the people of the Nation and my State and not to pick hot chestnuts out of the fire for any person, firm, or corporation.

If this amendment is adopted it will not be creating an additional burdensome public debt but it will be making a most important improvement which will pay dividends to the people many fold in the years to come. It is truly a capital investment.

If war ever comes again, and I hope it never does, this project will then be hailed as a great defense program. It is a real security measure for this land of ours regardless of what any other Member of Congress or anyone else may say to the contrary.

In times of peace it will be a real transportation boon to the States of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana.

As to the benefits which Nebraska would derive they would be immense, when one remembers that Nebraska, a great business and agricultural State, has 415 miles frontage on the Missouri River. It is now being penalized by one-way freight rates and as a result is unable to get its products to market without the burdens of unnecessary transportation expenses. This project will really enrich Nebraska and every State in the Union not only when it is fully developed but also for many years to come.

An effort has been made to scare the general public and the Congress with the frightening reactionary words that the cost of the project will mount to untold millions and billions of dollars, but I for one refuse to heed such ridiculous and child-mind-swaying language.

In the recent hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, second session of the Eighty-first Congress, General Pick, the present head of the Army engineers, estimated the total cost of the improvements to be \$169,117,000 exclusive of the costs of the Demopolis Dam, the estimated cost of which is \$20,843,000.

General Pick agreed also with the former head of the Army engineers, General Wheeler, that the project was proper and feasible.

Just how long this project can be delayed by fearsome and reactionary Members of Congress is not certain, but if it is not adequately financed at this time then the States which I have named heretofore should get ready to say "So long—a long so-long" to some of their present-day Congressmen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. We are going to build the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, and I think we are going to begin on it today, right here in this House. The gentleman from New York says it is just a dream. Well, the Erie Canal was just a dream. The Panama Canal was a nightmare. When they proposed to cut the Chicago drainage canal through into Lake Michigan so that they could use the water of Lake Michigan to maintain a stage of water in the Illinois River that comes down to St. Louis and on out into the Gulf, they said that was a dream and that it would drain Lake Michigan into the Gulf of Mexico and that it was not practical. But all those things are past the dream stage now.

Members of the House, we can thank God that the American people can still dream, because you have to think about a thing and you have to dream about it before you can begin to do it. This is past the dream stage. The gentleman from New York says he is afraid it is going to cost \$350,000,000. I do not know what it will cost. The figures of the gentleman from Mississippi indicate it will cost less than \$200,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have the figures of General Pick as of June 30 and he says it is \$169,117,000. We are faced with a yearly expenditure of \$15,000,000,000 for nobody knows how long to support national defense and we must sustain our country and improve it or we will not continue to be able to support our defense budget. I hope this committee approves the Rankin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have this privilege of speaking in behalf of the proposed amendment, which would appropriate \$2,000,000 with which to begin actual construction on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, and \$2,000,000 with which to continue construction of the Demopolis Lock and Dam, located at a point a short distance below the confluence of the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, near Demopolis, Ala.

The Demopolis lock and dam is located so as to be of material importance to the further development of both the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers.

Last year, we appropriated \$1,000,000 with which to begin construction of the lock and dam at Demopolis, and \$200,000 with which to complete the engineering plans on the Tombigbee project, which would connect the lower Tombigbee with the Tennessee.

For more than 100 years there has been agitation by farsighted men for a project to connect the Gulf of Mexico with the Great Lakes, and with the interior industrial cities of this country. Until this Government built the Pick-

wick Dam across the Tennessee River in 1938, the plan was not considered feasible. However, with the building of the Pickwick Dam, the project immediately became practical, and the Corps of United States Engineers surveyed a plan whereby, by placing the summit of the project in the Tennessee River, a slack water route could be provided from New Orleans or Mobile, Ala., to the Tennessee River.

Thus, boats and barges from the industrial cities of the North, laden with the manufactured products of that region—automobiles, grain products, farm machinery, appliances, and a hundred others—could navigate the swift downstream current of the Mississippi, and return to their points of origin over the Tombigbee slack-water route, loaded with the raw materials of the South—iron ore from Venezuela, timber, oil, and natural gas from Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, coal from the Warrior Alabama coal field, brown iron ore from Franklin County, Ala., the commercial clays and chalks of the region.

Survey after survey has shown this route to be economically justified. Shippers and users of this waterway would reap great savings. The great raw material resources of the South would be opened to industrial and commercial development and expansion. New jobs would be created in an area where unemployment is now very high, and in an area where the ravages of the boll weevil in 1949 destroyed the farmer's chance to make a profit on his crop.

It is particularly urgent that we start construction on this project this year. The progress of our great atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., depends upon the use of millions of tons of various raw materials. The transportation costs on these materials from the port of Mobile, Ala., to Oak Ridge, Tenn., would be cut in half.

The state of our relations with Russia today is such that we cannot discount the possibility of another war. We all hope and pray that it will not come. But we must take cognizance of the fact that 5 years after the close of the greatest, most terrifying and destructive war in all history that there is no peace in the world.

We must take due notice of the fact that only a few weeks ago, one of our planes with 11 American airmen aboard was wantonly shot down by the Russians. We face the threat of an attempt to push our forces out of Berlin, Germany. The wicked masters of the Russian people seem to be bent on trying to communize the world.

In the event that war should come with Russia, or with any other great Nation for that matter, this Tombigbee-Warrior-Tennessee waterway would immediately assume the utmost strategic importance.

If we start this project today, it will likely take from 5 to 10 years to complete it. If it is to be of value to us in time of war, we must construct it in time of peace.

If we build this project we cannot be accused of wasting the tax moneys of the Treasury. Instead, we will be making a

capital investment on this great country of ours, an improvement that will pay big dividends in time of peace, and infinitely greater dividends in time of war. In time of war the Tombigbee will be a protected inland waterway that it will be hard for the enemy to get at.

The Corps of United States Engineers says this is a practical project. At the direction of the Congress \$868,000 has been spent for engineering and planning. The logical next step is for this Congress to appropriate the money with which to start construction on the project.

The amount of money asked for in the pending amendment does not exceed the budget recommendation made in January for development on the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers.

I urge the Members of the House to pass this amendment. If we do, the generations that come after us will approve our foresight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] gets off the beam and runs up into hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a wonder to me he had not made it billions. He is thinking about foreign spending.

General Wheeler, in my opinion one of the ablest men who has ever been Chief of Engineers, testified that it would cost \$136,000,000. General Pick said on June 30, and I will read his testimony, in answer to Senator McKellar's question: General Pick said, "\$169,117,000 is our present estimate."

This is not a new project. It is an extension of our defense program, to give us a slackwater route into the Oak Ridge project. It is an extension, if you please, of our transportation system. The average man does not know that in 1948 on the Ohio River the traffic was 16,000,000 tons more than it was on the Panama Canal. On the Monongahela River it was 6,000,000 tons more than it was on the Panama Canal. Yet this traffic is bottled up. They cannot get that traffic back when it comes down this swift current of the Mississippi without being penalized by having to fight that swift current to get back.

We have 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi.

This project is merely an extension of our present inland waterway system, and our program of national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to take this opportunity to amplify the statements previously made in regard to the iron-ore deposits in Venezuela, and the plight of the steel corporations in looking to the future, the next 20 years, insofar as the depletion of the rich content of the ore deposits in the Mesabi Range of Minnesota are concerned. We had better plan ahead in terms of alternative routes, as far as our

inland waterways are concerned, with regard to the future of the steel industry of this Nation. I do not want to contend with the gentlemen from Maryland and their ports of entry at Baltimore, and in our areas in eastern Pennsylvania, but I do feel that if we are to fan out our shipments of ore deposits that are now being mined, especially in Venezuela, it will be necessary to look to further development and planning that goes with the inland-waterway system of this great Nation. I believe that as a further measure of national defense, and thinking in terms of our national interest and the future of this great Nation, we had better consider this amendment very seriously.

I refer you especially to the Joint Economic Committee hearings, held in January of this year, on the increased steel prices effective in December 1949. I beg of the membership that they carefully consider these amendments, especially in the light of steel price rise hearings in the light of the facts that they brought out.

The entire future of our shipments of ore deposits from Venezuela is tied in with the problem of our future development of our inland-waterways system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, somebody said something about the cost of this set-up. Eighteen locks at other places and they cost fifteen to twenty million dollars. Here they put in something like \$80,000,000. It is perfectly apparent that they cost \$217,000,000. Eighteen times \$15,000,000 is \$270,000,000. With the terrific excavation that is the equivalent of 88,000,000 yards of dirt to move I wonder if anybody here is going to be deluded into believing that there is not any cost to doing such an enormous job. I only want the Members of this House to realize what they are getting into if they stick their necks out to start this terrific project.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The estimates of the Army engineers have not worked out very well. Their estimates are very unreliable according to past performances.

Mr. TABER. That is the record they have submitted to us.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York referred to this Tombigbee project as a half-billion-dollar project. There is some argument about the figures, but I wish to set forth for the Committee just a few figures that the Committee has actual cognizance of, figures that have bounded upward in quotations made to us in succeeding years in the rivers and harbors and flood-

control budget. The flood-control situation is worse than the rivers and harbors situation.

Here is a figure of \$6,228,000 in 1949, which in 1951 becomes \$10,300,000. Here is a 1949 figure of \$13,216,000 that has gone up to \$17,123,000. Here is another one, \$28,771,000 that is now up to \$42,208,000. Here is one of \$164,000,000-plus which is now up to \$185,000,000. Here is another, \$9,860,000, that is now \$15,090,000. Here is one of \$3,144,000 that is now \$4,615,000. So there is some justification for the statement and the apprehension expressed by the distinguished gentleman from New York when he refers to the Tombigbee as a half-billion-dollar proposition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Not now. The gentleman has talked two or three times, and this is the first time I have spoken on the subject.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to correct the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. I decline to yield.

There is no evidence before the Appropriations Committee that the Tombigbee project is a security measure; and there is no approval of the Bureau of the Budget for construction. Understand that, there is no approval by the Bureau, it never has been approved for construction by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will not yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is making a mistake.

Mr. RABAUT. I will not be interrupted by the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; but you ought not to make a misstatement like that.

Mr. RABAUT. I want that out of the Record.

Mr. RANKIN. I will put it back in the Record.

Mr. RABAUT. You can do it, but in your own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield. The gentleman cannot put anything in the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan unless the gentleman from Michigan yields to him.

Mr. RABAUT. Let me remind you that we have a debt today of \$257,000,000,000. If you could print a debt in red because it was red and because it was great, I do not know where you could get the color. It is getting redder every day, yet this House is filled with voices who say: "I am for economy but," "I am for economy but."

We have an example of that here today. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for \$1,000,000 plus, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for \$2,000,000 plus, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] four and one-half million dollars plus, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] \$2,000,000 plus, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] \$1,300,000. They are not all to be added together, but these are the sums that are offered by gentlemen who are for economy but.

When are we going to get down to economy? When are we going to take a straight look at this figure of \$257,000,000,000 in the red?

Why did the committee take this action? Why did it stop planning for 1 year? So that we might concentrate on the pending projects that are with the engineers at this time, just like any businessman would stop and take stock of a tremendous undertaking. That is our reason. That is why we stand here.

It is not a popular position that I take, but I am charged with the legislative responsibility to bring this bill before you as reported by the committee, and for that reason I present it to you and tell you the reasons why I hope we will not be hearing this whole afternoon "I am for economy but."

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there are now four proposals pending—the Passman amendment, the Rankin substitute, the Brooks amendment to the substitute, and the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment. Am I correct in my understanding that the first vote will be on the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment, followed by a vote on the Brooks amendment to the Rankin substitute, then we will vote on the Rankin substitute, whether amended or not, then, finally, if the Rankin substitute is not adopted we will vote on the Passman amendment, as amended, if it is amended?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. It may obviate further parliamentary inquiries if the Chair might be indulged a moment. On page 6 of Cannon's Procedure a diagram will be found that illustrates the present situation very clearly and if the Chair may be indulged further he will further illustrate by the use of his hand.

Here is the text of the pending bill, here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the Passman amendment, here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi as a substitute for the Passman amendment, here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] as an amendment to the substitute.

They will be submitted in the order, first, the amendment to the Passman amendment, next the Brooks amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, then on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, then on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Louisiana offered an amendment which in part applied to line 1 and in part to line 10, on page 337. To which of these parts does his amendment apply?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has offered one amendment; his original amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Which is his original amendment then? To what line does it apply? Does it apply to both places?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] offered an amendment which applies to two different lines in the pending paragraph.

Mr. RABAUT. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Does the Rankin amendment omit reference to line 1?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be difficult for the Chair to explain all four of these amendments when we have had nearly an hour of debate here. By having the amendment again reported, that should answer the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Passman amendment may be divided into two parts, one of which is a proviso, and the second part of his proposal is to another and independent part of this bill 10 lines further on. The Passman amendment is susceptible of a division. The Rankin amendment and the Brooks amendment to the Rankin amendment only amend one part of the Passman amendment. If the Rankin amendment is adopted, the first part of the Passman amendment remains. Is not that the situation?

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing to respond to. The gentleman is simply explaining the amendment.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 38, noes 121.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Passman amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON to the Passman amendment: Strike out "\$188,678,000" and insert "\$188,978,000."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman

man from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 57, noes 116.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is the amendment as amended, increasing it merely \$1,000,000?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Passman amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PASSMAN) there were—ayes 51, noes 112.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio: On page 337, line 10, after the sum and before the colon, insert "of which \$75,000 shall be available for dredging in the Old River, Cleveland, Ohio, out of amounts allotted to other purposes for Cleveland Harbor as authorized by law."

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It does not call for any increase or decrease in the funds. It merely grants authority to the engineers to use \$75,000 of the already allocated sum for the Cleveland Harbor for the very important deepening of what we call the old river from 21 to 23 feet. This is particularly important at this time because of the fact that the Lake Erie level is in a down cycle and this increases the problem of getting the large barges to the docks on this river.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to without any difficulty.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very familiar with that project and I think it is extremely deserving. I hope it will receive the unanimous support of the membership.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this particular project is not budgeted. It is dredging to a private dock. The engineers considered it not important enough to budget at this time.

That is my whole argument about the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it appears that everybody wants to get in on the Democratic act these days—particularly when the act has proven as successful as the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam, which President Truman will dedicate this Thursday.

I was surprised—and a bit dismayed—to learn that the Republican Party is now trying to get in on the act by taking credit for Grand Coulee. Former Gov. Harold Stassen—whose Presidential ambitions are apparently not satisfied by the mere presidency of a great university—made the interesting and daring statement in a political speech last week in New York that the plans for Grand Coulee Dam were prepared under President Hoover.

Now I know that the president of a university as great as Pennsylvania is interested in getting at the facts. So here are some facts about the development of Grand Coulee—so that it will be very clear as to just who did what.

The plans for Grand Coulee were not prepared overnight, during the administration of any one President. The idea for Grand Coulee and the entire Columbia Basin irrigation project originally appeared in the first annual report to the Congress of the Federal Reclamation Service. The date was 1903—not during Mr. Hoover's administration.

Over a number of years, more detailed surveys were made. The construction of the dam was not authorized until May 15, 1928—10 months before Mr. Hoover was inaugurated as President—not during his administration.

But billions of dollars of projects are authorized which are never built. Authorization does not mean construction. It only means that the funds can be appropriated. But without the money, you can not even buy a bag of cement.

So what actually did happen during Mr. Hoover's administration, when Governor Stassen says the plans were prepared? The answer is "Absolutely nothing."

It was not that the subject was not brought up, mind you. On January 7, 1932, while Mr. Hoover was still in the White House, the Chief Engineer of the

Bureau of Reclamation submitted a report to the President, recommending the construction of Grand Coulee and the Columbia Basin irrigation project.

Apparently, President Hoover took little notice of this recommendation—for he had 14 months left in the White House to take action on it. What did he do? The answer again is—absolutely nothing.

It was not until 1933 that President Roosevelt, who realized the potential of the dam and the irrigation project, allotted funds under the National Industrial Recovery Act for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam. The irrigation project was authorized later in a specific statute—under a Democratic Congress.

These are the facts, Mr. Chairman. They show that the Republican Party—and the Hoover administration—were apparently quite ready to plan and wait. But President Roosevelt, and the Democratic Party, were not satisfied with planning and waiting. They believed—and still believe—in action.

There is hardly a person in the Northwest—including our businessmen—who does not, now that the deed is done and the dam is built, realize the far-sightedness of President Roosevelt in giving the green light to the construction of Grand Coulee. The chief engineer of one of the biggest pulp and paper concerns on the west coast acknowledged publicly, not long ago, that he had once opposed the public power program—but that he knows now that his business could not have survived without it. So I do not wonder that the governor is so anxious to get in on the act.

Thirteen of the 18 huge generators have already been installed, and can now produce a peak load of nearly 1,700,000 kilowatts, enough electricity to illuminate well over 3,000,000 homes. The ultimate capacity at the dam will be just under 2,000,000 kilowatts.

This power has formed the basis not only for tremendous industrial growth in the Northwest, but also for the largest atomic reactor in the world, at Richland, Wash. This power enabled the Northwest to produce half the Nation's aluminum during the war. Our amazing production records for airplanes would not have been possible without the foresight of President Roosevelt.

It is highly appropriate that President Truman will also dedicate, on Thursday, the largest man-made lake in the West, created by Grand Coulee Dam—for the lake is to bear the name of the great American leader who caused this man-made Niagara Falls to be built—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

At Grand Coulee, work is being rushed to complete the world's largest pumps, driven by the world's largest motors, which will soon boost water from Lake Roosevelt into a feeder canal, and from there to enough irrigable land to accommodate 13,000 family-sized farms.

The over-all cost of Grand Coulee Dam, and the Columbia Basin irrigation project, will be about \$773,000,000—but every cent of this investment will be returned to the Federal Treasury—three-fourths of it from the sale of power, and one-fourth from irrigation revenues.

That is a sound investment of the taxpayers' money.

So Mr. Governor Stassen, I am glad that you feel that Grand Coulee has been such a tremendous success that you are anxious to give the credit to Mr. Hoover.

But please, Mr. Governor, let us get the facts straight.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER: On page 337, line 10, after the semicolon, strike out "\$187,678,000" and insert "\$183,178,000."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore to the bill the amount recommended by the budget for the improvement of the Monongahela River near Morgantown, W. Va., known as lock No. 10.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$2,000,000. The engineers, I assume, desire that amount. It seems to me, that without any rhyme or reason, the subcommittee reduced this amount by half a million dollars. The project has been nearing completion, and if this half million is cut from the amount recommended by the budget, it will necessitate allowing to remain as an obstruction to navigation two old locks that have been lying there for years and years. It would mean, in addition to that, a considerable increase in the total cost of completing the project. I can see no reason whatsoever for cutting this half million dollars off of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. When you realize that these barges loaded with coal, iron, and other material are going up and down the river, and they are confronted with two old locks that remain in the river as an obstruction to navigation, so that the tows cannot use even the new locks that are practically completed, there seems to be no sense whatever in reducing the budget figure, just for the ostensible showing of saving a half million dollars. New bids will have to be asked for. Perhaps new contractors will bid. Perhaps new equipment will have to be brought onto the scene, and it would be a waste of money to reduce this \$2,000,000 asked for by the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers to \$1,500,000.

This is really a worth-while project. If we complete a 9-foot project but cannot use it, then all the money is wasted for a year or maybe two. If you cut off this half million dollars it means that for 12 months you have to use something that is outmoded and has been outmoded for many years. In other words, you have to break up your tow and go through the old locks twice; it is either that or attempt to use the new locks and break up your tow because this obstruction is in the river. I submit, and I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me, that at the present time tows and barges can only be used to 60 or 70 percent of capacity. If we cut the budget recommendations by half a million dollars the benefits of the 9-foot channel will be delayed another 12 months. The gentleman will agree that \$2,000,000 is necessary to complete the project. Why cut this half million from

it and delay its use to maximum capacity? No industrial concern would ever cut half a million out of a two-million project and leave it worthless for another 12 months. It will cost more in the long run to make this one-half million cut than it will to appropriate the full amount now. I sincerely hope that the subcommittee will agree to this addition of \$500,000 to the \$1,500,000 now in the bill as reported. The adoption of my amendment will actually save Government expenditures in the long run.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to debate with my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania who at times has been my genial fishing partner and associate, but I just want to say with regard to this Monongahela River project that the reason for the action of the committee can be told in one short sentence: That project has an unobligated balance of \$937,400. The committee in its wisdom felt that that was enough money for them to proceed with this year in view of the condition of the Treasury.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman will not deny that the project will be delayed 12 additional months by cutting off this half million.

Mr. RABAUT. But I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that no family faced with a purse that is in the condition of the purse of Uncle Sam today would indulge in any needless expenditure.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman will also admit that the ultimate cost will be greater if we cut off this half million.

Mr. RABAUT. The committee is advised that the project has \$937,400 unexpended. We felt they had enough for this year.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman will not deny the logic of what I have said, will he?

Mr. RABAUT. I admire the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his defense of projects in his district and in the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 21, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 337, line 10, strike out "\$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$192,923,000"; and on page 338, line 10, for the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That \$5,250,000 of the amount here-

in provided shall be available for planning and initiating the construction of the Ice Harbor Dam on Snake River, Wash."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that was carried in the last annual appropriation bill and the project has been authorized. The item was put in the construction project program by the Army engineers, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, carried in an appropriation bill and it passed the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order, too.

Mr. Chairman, I read from the report of the Army engineers on this particular project:

The division engineer has restudied the problem of water use in the Columbia and Snake Basins in the light of changed conditions.

He finds the most suitable plan for the ultimate improvement of the two streams between the Bonneville Dam and Lewiston, Idaho, to be a series of 4 locks and dams for complete canalization of the middle Columbia between the head of the Bonneville pool and the mouth of the Snake, and a series of 10 locks and dams for complete canalization of the Snake from its mouth to Lewiston.

He accordingly finds that the Umatilla Dam and the four dams proposed for the Snake River should be constructed before undertaking slack-water improvement of the Columbia below Umatilla, where a fairly adequate channel already exists.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in the view that the foregoing plans constitute a satisfactory, comprehensive, and integrated program for the initial and ultimate development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers between Bonneville and Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the committee that the Columbia River is now navigable all the way up to its confluence with the Snake River at Pasco, Wash. The construction of three dams already approved by the Army engineers will permit navigation to Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, for many years we have had navigation on the Snake River in the high-water season. What we need now is a slack-water route up to Lewiston, Idaho. We have in the making of the great Columbia River Basin a project of 200,000 acres down river from the country surrounding Lewiston, the Columbia Basin project nearing completion and the people are eagerly waiting to go on the land. In order to move the products from the forest, in order to move building materials, stone, lime, and things like that downstream, we needed to improve the river for navigation between the confluence of the Snake River at Pasco and the confluence of the Snake and the Clearwater Rivers at Lewiston, Idaho.

This project has been approved and voted on and has been passed by the House of Representatives. It failed of passage in the Senate last year due to

the fact it was stated no fish ladders had been provided for the Fish and Wildlife Service. We now find that the fishways have been provided for and now this project has been dropped out of this appropriation bill after being put in by the Army engineers. I ask that it be restored and included in this bill.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Would not the establishment of the Ice Harbor Dam give us transportation facilities as well as power facilities to serve that whole inland empire?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct.

Mr. HOLMES. And, in turn, these transportation facilities would effect the clearance of wheat and the products of the Inland Empire down through the Snake River to its confluence with the Columbia and on to the coast.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is exactly correct. This transportation system has been in use since the early settlement of the country, but only during high-water times, but now, with the construction of the Umatilla Dam we will have transportation facilities upstream to transport the materials needed to build this great project that is now under construction.

Mr. HOLMES. The slack-water pool created by the construction of McNary Dam would fit right into this series of dams on the Snake River.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct.

Mr. HOLMES. And the Ice Harbor Dam is the pivotal dam in relation to the lower dams, as well as serving the power-development program.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is 100-percent correct. It is a very short-sighted policy to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that there was \$250,000 in the budget for planning, but this year, as we explained earlier and as the gentleman has heard, we have allowed no money for planning on any new project, seeking to have the Army engineers get up to date. We are taking stock of everything, and I am sorry that the gentleman's project falls in that category, and for that reason the amount was not allowed. There is no particular antagonism to the gentleman's project. I want him to know that. This falls in the category that we are not allowing planning here for new construction, and this project seeks \$250,000 for planning.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman appreciates the fact that this item was contained in the last annual appropriation bill, not only for planning but for construction, and it passed this House. It passed the House in the annual appropriation bill, and when it came back this time it was reduced to planning.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I remember the incident.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. This project has already been approved by this House.

Mr. RABAUT. The amount was cut out last year because of a controversy. The Senate cut the amount out because of the fact that a controversy developed about the fish ladders, and under the situation the committee did not know what to do. So, naturally, when in doubt, do not act. We refused to act until they settled the matter of the fish climbing the ladders.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman knows that that question has been resolved and the fish ladders have been provided for, and there is no objection to the project on that score.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. In order to clarify the fish-ladder controversy, it is my understanding that the fish-ladder problem connected with the construction of this dam has been cleared up by an agreement that was arrived at last year with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RABAUT. That may be true, but it is not now budgeted for construction. It was budgeted this year only for planning. It comes under the general heading of planning and for that reason falls under our general rule that there shall be no money for planning this year. We have nothing against this particular project, it is just that there is no money in the bill this year for the planning of this project or any other project. They are all treated alike; there is no money for planning.

I know the gentleman's devotion to this proposition and I admire him for it, but it is just one of those cases where it was eliminated last year because of the controversy over the fish, and it is eliminated this year because of the ruling of the committee about allowing money for planning.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. As a Member of Congress representing the great fisheries area of Oregon, I will say that the controversy has not been settled as to the fish ladders. The fish industry objects to this. I should also like to say that the Portland Oregonian, the biggest paper in Oregon; the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the biggest paper in the State of Washington; and the Yakima Herald, in the congressional district of the gentleman from Washington, the biggest paper in his district, are all opposed to it, and I could name a half a dozen

others. I am very much opposed to it myself.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLSON: On page 337, line 10, strike out "\$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$188,995,600, of which amount there shall be available for projects in Massachusetts the following sums: \$106,700 for the Cohasset Harbor project; \$124,000 for the Duxbury Harbor project; \$18,300 for the Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay Channel project; \$95,100 for the Wellfleet Harbor project; \$756,000 for the Provincetown Harbor project; \$182,500 for the Hyannis Harbor project; and \$35,000 for the Falmouth Harbor project.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I had the idea that by putting all these projects in I might get one or two or three or four, but it looks as though I am rather in the position of the fellow who went fishing. Someone asked him how he got along, and he said, "Well, I didn't get what I expected, but I didn't expect I would."

These propositions have all been studied and passed on by Congresses for a great many years. The United States Army engineers have approved them all. The engineers have shown in their reports to the Congress that it is economy for the Government to help out the State of Massachusetts and the towns where these harbors are. We have to pay half the expense of either dredging or putting out jetties. We have been in rather a tough situation because we have had two hurricanes in the last 12 years that did a terrible lot of damage to these harbors. As a matter of fact, you cannot get into some of them except at high tide. Of course, the tide ebbs and flows every 6 hours, and it is kind of tough when you have to wait 6 hours to get in with your catch.

We are going to have sent to us by the President of the United States a communication to take care of the small business of the country.

Here are a thousand or two thousand people who are in small business. They get their living at this business. They pay their taxes to the town and the State and Federal Governments. They make a living because they have a harbor to come into to unload their catch.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up any more time. I know that the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend this. Well, they did not recommend anything else. The only place a Member can urge that a bill be passed or that an item be included in this bill is not down at the Bureau of the Budget, but here in the Halls of Congress. I will take the advice of the Bureau of the Budget occasionally, but when they are wrong, I reserve the right to stand up and vote against the Bureau. I am sure the rest of you do likewise, and here is an opportunity for you to exercise your right.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There are many worth-while projects which have been left out by the Bureau of the Budget. I presume that the four projects referred to by the champion of the fishermen were some of those projects. But the committee has eliminated some budgeted projects this year and certainly it would be difficult for us to go along or ask the House to go along on unbudgeted items.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 337, line 10, strike out "\$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$185,878,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Do I understand the gentleman is reducing the figure?

Mr. SUTTON. It seems queer and funny, but I am trying to reduce it by \$1,800,000 on a project in my own district.

Mr. Chairman, there is a project in the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee by the Army engineers which has a low dam known as the Cheatham Lock and Dam and Dover Dam on the lower Cumberland River. This project is very controversial. It has been a matter of controversy for something over a year. On January 27, 1950, Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Congressman PRIEST, Congressman GORE and I wrote the President of the United States and requested that the TVA make a survey of the lower Cumberland River to find out which place it would be better to have a dam and whether it should be a high dam or a low dam. The Army engineers have wanted to build a low dam for several years, but there has been much controversy in all the counties affected. So on February 2, 1950, the President requested that the TVA make a survey to see what would be inundated and what would be best to recommend to the people. In this appropriation there are \$1,800,000 for this project. I am asking the committee to go along and cut this \$1,800,000 so that the dam will not be built until this survey has been made by the TVA. Then we can find out what will actually be done to the people's land in that district.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. When do you expect that report to be made, so that we can act intelligently on this matter.

Mr. SUTTON. The TVA suggested that it might be 11 months before the

report came in. Actually there will be no project this year if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. GOLDEN. Has the President ordered the survey?

Mr. SUTTON. He has ordered that survey. So here is a chance for you to economize and cut this \$1,800,000 out. I am of the opinion that no dam should be built until we find out actually what should be done. As I say, this is in my own congressional district and I hope until a survey is made that the Committee on Appropriations and the House will go along and eliminate this money until the time comes when we find out what is best for the people down there as a result of this survey which is to be made at the President's request.

I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. At the time the engineers were before us there was \$1,300,000 of \$1,400,000 that was appropriated last year that had not been obligated. I was wondering if the gentleman could tell us whether that money had heretofore been obligated, since the engineers were before us.

Mr. SUTTON. It is my understanding that it has not, but I am not sure.

Mr. TABER. You understand it has not been?

Mr. SUTTON. That is correct. In 1949 the Army engineers estimated this would cost \$9,900,000. They came before the committee this time and estimated it would cost \$15,264,000. Actually, they do not know yet. In fact, I think everything should be held up until a complete survey is made.

Mr. TABER. Does this not sound reasonable?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised to receive this information. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I assure the Committee I will not take 5 minutes.

The purpose of taking the floor is to make an inquiry of the committee. Out of \$341,000,000 in this bill for flood control, Michigan has but one item of \$490,000. The total amount of that project, and it is the Red Run project in southeast Oakland County, affecting eight cities, was \$1,010,000. Five hundred thousand dollars was appropriated last year in a previous bill. That leaves a balance of \$510,000 to complete the work. The committee has seen fit to reduce that to \$490,000, or a cut of \$20,000. On the bottom of page 255 of the report on this bill is a notation that the project is to be completed within the amount recom-

mended. That is completed with \$490,000. My inquiry is this: Was there any evidence submitted to the committee by the Army engineers or those in charge of the work—the project is already under construction—to show that \$490,000 is sufficient to complete the work, that would justify a cut of \$20,000.

Mr. RABAUT. The study of the committee indicates that there was an unexpended balance of \$479,900. They had not got started. Prices were higher at the time the work was started than they are at the present time. They wanted \$565,000 and the committee, in its wisdom, figured that \$490,000 would complete the transaction.

Mr. DONDERO. The only thing I am interested in is to know that the amount in the bill is sufficient to complete the work.

Mr. RABAUT. We feel that it would.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I have a similar situation in a flood-control project at Portville, N. Y. There is a notation at the bottom of the report of the subcommittee that the work must be completed within the amount set forth. The contractor refuses to sign the contract on the ground that he cannot complete the work in the area, that will save the people in case of another flood. If he cannot do the work the way it ought to be done, he will not do it. The Army has restricted him to an area that does not cover the whole flood district.

Mr. RABAUT. The engineers have been told by the committee to complete the work.

Mr. TABER. An \$850,000 project.

Mr. REED of New York. It works an injustice because they restrict the work of the contractor to an area that falls short of taking in what ought to be covered under the contract, and he will not take it because he can only make his money in the other part of the territory which the Army said he could not cover at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. The purpose of my inquiry was, regarding the Red Run, because of the vitally important nature of this project to a population of over 150,000 people in eight cities in my district. That is the reason I wanted to be sure that the amount included by the committee was sufficient to complete the work.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not know whether the gentleman knows it or not, but I went out personally to view the project. The gentleman will remember the support the project received last year when the project was allowed.

Mr. DONDERO. I do, and I thank the gentleman for his support of the project.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of explaining the situation that exists with reference to the Portville project in New York. I have checked it and have found an astounding situation that I think the House should know about and that the head of the War Department should know about.

At the time the hearings were held that project had an unobligated balance of \$371,300. The committee carried an item of \$850,000 to complete the job. That makes a total of \$1,221,300. The Army engineers have received a bid to complete the projects from this contractor, the whole project, not just part of it, for \$1,186,464; or \$34,836 less than the amount they will have available, and still the Army engineers refuse to let the contract unless they get \$250,000 more. What for, goodness only knows. That is the kind of job that has been done there.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. And the trouble is that they have started a fire and now expect me to correct the situation when they tell the people that under the present allowance of money they cannot complete the job so that it will save them in the event of another extraordinary flood. These people have been flooded so badly that they have had to be taken out from the second stories of their houses at night in boats. They have these terrific floods and now they are told that they cannot do the job on the money allowed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I pointed out in my statement of April 7, my understanding is that after this project was adopted, after it was authorized, that there was an increase in the population up and down the stream there and it was clearly evident that unless the project were extended it would not protect the lives and property of those people. The engineers asked for an increase in estimate. There is nothing personal about this so far as I am concerned, for it is not in the part of the country in which I live.

Mr. TABER. But there has been money enough provided in the bill and in the carry-over to cover the cost of the contract at the price that the contractor has bid to do the whole complete job, yet they will not let the contract. They have \$34,000 margin and still they will not let the contract. There is no sense at all to that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not mean to delay, but they maintain that if they do let the contract it will not under the appropriation previously made and under the limitations of this appropriation provide for an extension of the project that will protect those people who are not being protected.

Mr. TABER. Why would the contractor bid less than the amount available and have that situation except on the basis of doing the whole job? I cannot see; it is beyond me.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All I know is that evidently the contract has not been let for the amount that is to be appropriated here; otherwise there would be no occasion for the appropriation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: On page 338, line 10, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For work on the Barcelona project in the State of New York, \$100,000."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for a moral obligation involved in my amendment, I would not take the floor at this time, but I believe that moral obligations should be kept, by an individual or by a nation, and as a Representative in this Congress I feel I owe it to a community which has acted in good faith to take this floor at the present time and do everything within my power to persuade the committee to accept my amendment.

This is a unique community for which I am speaking today. It has a very ancient harbor located on the south shore of Lake Erie between Buffalo and Erie. It has been a fishing harbor for many years, it has been a harbor of refuge for a century, it has been a navigation school for the training of young men in practical seamanship for many years. It has also been a life-saving station during its entire existence as a harbor.

Barcelona, N. Y., was made a port of entry as early as 1831. They built up a very fine community there and the Government gave them some aid in the early days. The Federal Government in days when it was not so affluent as it has been at other times needed a lighthouse. Who built that lighthouse? A public-spirited man in that community built a very fine lighthouse that stands there today. It has sent out its beams of warning to the commerce on the Great Lakes for years and years to keep the ships off the dangerous shoals and rocks near the shore. It is impossible to know how many human lives it has saved.

There is a great fishing ground just off this little harbor of Barcelona and for years they have brought in their countless tons of fish to feed the Nation, particularly in time of war. It is 17 miles to a harbor of refuge to the east and 38 miles to the west. There are thousands upon thousands of small boats today operating along the shores of our Great Lakes. They need this as a harbor of refuge.

To show you how far the civic-minded people have gone to maintain this harbor which they need, they have built wharves, they built the lighthouse, they built storage facilities there, they put their own money into these projects over a period of 119 years.

The Government ceased appropriating for Barcelona Harbor, the port of Westfield, N. Y., with the result that the silt and the sand and the dirt and the rocks have been thrown into the harbor due to the action of the heavy and frequent storms. The community itself is

being devastated. These fishermen cannot get their boats into the harbor to unload their catch, and as a consequence they are obliged to desert their homes and move to other ports. In 1945, \$303,000 was authorized by the Congress for this project with the condition precedent imposed by the Federal Government that the community would bond itself for \$7,500 to do its part toward the construction of this project. That condition required the citizens to go to Albany, the State capital, at great expense, with their attorneys, to obtain an enabling act to authorize the taxpayers to vote a bond issue. When that bond issue came up to be voted on under the enabling act it was the first time in the history of the community, which is more than a century old, that the village of Westfield had voted a bond issue. They passed the bond issue by a vote of more than 30 to 1, showing that the people were united in favor of the project, and they believed, of course, when they bonded themselves, that the Federal Government would perform its part. I say frankly that the Bureau of the Budget did not see fit to recommend this item but here is the moral obligation of the transaction. The moral obligation is that if this improvement is suffered to be delayed another year before beginning this work, every fishing boat will be driven out of the Barcelona Harbor, and they will be forced to go miles and miles from their fishing grounds. In other words, it will deny the fishermen and others a harbor of refuge for the fishing boats, and it will compel the boats to go out many miles from other ports and thus run the chance of sudden storms which might wreck them before the sailors could return to safety. If you fail to begin construction now, many lives may be lost because the Congress failed to restore this harbor of refuge.

Here is a community that since 1831 has been putting in its own money; it built the lighthouse necessary for commerce on the Great Lakes. Even when the sailing vessel days were passing out of the navigation picture the people raised money, incorporated, and built a steamboat which operated out of this harbor. So I feel that I am not making an unreasonable request of this Congress as a moral obligation of the Government to approve at least \$100,000 in this bill to start the restoration of Barcelona Harbor.

Now, just stop and think of it. Most of you Members have been to Europe. We have been supplying money to a socialistic government, and I have no quarrel with the free-enterprise people themselves in that country. But they have been using their own tax money to pay short-term bills; they have been using our taxpayers' money to buy wigs, monacles, and other nonessential articles at our expense. It seems to me that the time has come for us to measure up to our own moral obligation at home and not devastate and destroy a fishing harbor, a harbor of refuge, just because we have the power to do it. I am not criticizing the subcommittee. The subcommittee has treated me with every cour-

tesy, but when the Bureau of the Budget fails to act in a crisis like this I feel that Congress represents the people of the United States and that they should meet the home emergencies instead of financing emergencies all over the world.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. What is the population of that community?

Mr. REED of New York. The population is three or four thousand. Is that worth destroying or keeping?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, it is not a question of destroying it. We do not want to destroy it. I just wanted to ask a question, that is all.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to quote from the hearings before this subcommittee on page 593:

Mr. TABER. What is the estimated cost of this project, Mr. REED?

Mr. REED. The amount authorized is \$791,000, as I recall.

This is \$791,000, and three or four thousand people are involved.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. That figure is not correct. It was a typographical error. The amount is \$303,000. I am asking for only \$100,000 to commence the work.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows that no new projects are being started this year. I admire the gentleman for his devotion to his district, but there is a time when we have to take cognizance of the condition of the Treasury. The gentleman's project is in the same category as all the rest of them.

I ask for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REED of New York) there were—ayes 17, noes 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: On page 338, after line 10, insert "\$100,000, appropriated in the bill, be made available for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, New York."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think I have presented this case

very fairly. I hope I can impress the committee with this thought: The condition of this harbor has become such, as a result of the heavy storms that have afflicted it that the failure to improve the harbor now will result in driving the few remaining small boats out of there thus rendering the Barcelona Harbor absolutely useless for commercial purposes. If the work is commenced now, this year, and \$100,000 made available, then we can save this harbor for the citizens and thus save this community asset for a community that has met its own civic responsibility as well as a part of the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York seeks to take \$100,000 from other projects to which the money has been assigned. Every penny in the bill is earmarked for some particular thing. The gentleman is asking that \$100,000 be assigned to this project. I do not feel the committee can start going on record in favor of a request such as this because it would be very discriminatory against others who have planned their projects and made certain justifications whereby the money was allocated to their projects. The amendment pretty well answers itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of confidence in this subcommittee and in its work, but I question the wisdom of a cut inflicted by the subcommittee in the Jim Woodruff Dam project in the great and important Apalachicola Waterway. That project was cut from \$5,000,000 to \$3,500,000.

During the Easter recess I visited the site of the dam and talked at length with the engineers in charge of that project. They are there on the ground and they have all the facts. They told me without qualification that a cut from \$5,000,000 to \$3,500,000 in that project is, for valid and sound reasons, going to mean a delay of 2 years in the completion of the project.

Once that project is completed, the Government will take in \$1,033,000 a year from hydroelectric power. The 2 years' delay which the present cut may entail will mean that we are going to lose over \$2,000,000 in revenue and to lose badly needed electric power and the use of the waterway for 2 years in order to delay—not save—the expenditure of \$1,500,000. Therefore, I question the wisdom of the committee in cutting the funds for that valuable project and I trust that they will be restored.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to offer an amendment, but I want to ask several

questions of the subcommittee with reference to two of the projects in California. I am interested in the item on page 250 of the report referred to as the Sacramento River, \$1,500,000. We were able to convince the Bureau of the Budget that they should give us \$2,500,000 for the project. I think the reason was that by making a Federal appropriation it would release \$3,750,000 of local money. Another matter about which I am concerned is this: the purpose of part of this Federal money is to build a short canal from the Sacramento River to the turning basin of the deep-water channel, or the artificial channel which the engineers will build. On that little canal a large grain elevator is being constructed on the supposition that this appropriation might be large enough to build that canal which will connect the Sacramento River with the turning basin of the Sacramento ship channel. What I would like to know is just how did the committee happen to reduce the amount? Was it just a general economy move, or was there some other specific reason for it?

Mr. RABAUT. There was an unobligated balance of \$1,419,500 on December 31. In this appropriation they got \$1,700,000. So they have a considerable sum of money left.

Mr. JOHNSON. We got \$1,500,000?

Mr. RABAUT. Just a minute. Last year the appropriation was \$1,700,000, of which they had an unexpended balance on December 31 of \$1,419,500. So they had only scratched the amount given last year. Now we have added to that this year \$1,000,000. So they have a very substantial sum of money. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think it does, too. I would like to ask about another project on page 254 of the report. The item is in California and is referred to as the Farmington Reservoir, \$500,000. We were able to convince the Bureau of the Budget that they should give us the total amount required for the completion of that dam. The total amount that they estimated would be required to complete the dam was \$1,674,000. The Bureau of the Budget allowed the full amount in order to get the dam out of the way and completed this year, which is good economy. It is better to get these things completed and out of the way instead of dragging them out year after year. I would like to know what impelled the subcommittee to make such a drastic cut in that Bureau recommendation?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, the situation is practically the same. They have more money to work with now than they have needed. Last year we gave them \$1,700,000. The unexpended balance as at the end of the year was \$1,510,800. We have given them \$500,000 additional. So they have over \$2,000,000. In view of the situation of Uncle Sam's purse, I think the committee did pretty well by them.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to explain this. I think a good part of that first appropriation is tied up in contracts for the purchase of land. We have not paid for the property but we have committed it. So it means that the construction money will be reduced very

drastically. Apparently the Budget Bureau was motivated by the idea that they would recommend the full amount and this year build the entire dam. But whatever the committee decision was I will have to abide by it. I thank the gentleman for giving me the explanations. I wanted to get this in the RECORD so that anybody reading it will know exactly what the committee had in mind when they made the cuts. I appreciate the courtesy and the generosity of this committee very much.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boggs of Delaware: On page 338, after line 10, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Inland waterway, Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay, Del.: For prosecution of the works of improvement with respect to the inland waterway, Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay, Del., as authorized in the River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945 (Public Law 41, 79th Cong.), \$122,000."

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, in the brief space of only a few minutes which have been allotted to me, I shall earnestly strive to justify and to obtain the support of the Members for the amendment which I have submitted and you have just heard.

The amendment provides for the inclusion of an appropriation of \$122,000 for the improvement of the inland waterway and Roosevelt Inlet at Lewes, Del.

This project is not a new one. This existing Federal project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, and provides for the deepening of the existing channel from a present depth of 6 feet to a necessary depth of 10 feet.

The district engineer, the division engineer, and the Chief of Army Engineers specifically recommended in the 1951 budget request that there be included \$122,000 to be used for dredging this waterway channel to a depth of 10 feet. This specific request for funds to complete a necessary project authorized by the Congress 5 years ago was deleted by the Bureau of the Budget, and no satisfactory explanation for the deletion of this appropriation has as yet been given.

This authorized Federal project at the Roosevelt Inlet is the key to several other river and harbor projects. It is also the key to the effectiveness of other vitally important operations which are largely dependent upon the existence of a 10-foot channel from Roosevelt Inlet to the turning basin at Lewes, Del. One of the other Federal projects of long standing and recognized importance which is dependent upon the deepening of this channel is the Harbor of Refuge in Delaware Bay. This Harbor of Refuge is used by naval and commercial vessels whenever severe adverse weather conditions exist on the Delaware Bay or the adjacent Atlantic Ocean area.

Immediately adjacent to Lewes, Del., is Fort Miles, an Army installation of real importance to our seaboard defenses. The Army finds it necessary and essential to use seagoing vessels in connection

with its extensive mine-laying and anti-aircraft training programs. These Army ships must use the Roosevelt Inlet, and the present depth of the channel is considered inadequate for fullest utilization.

The United States Coast Guard is also dependent on the use of this waterway. The Commandant of the Coast Guard has stated that a channel depth of 10 feet would be advantageous to Coast Guard operations in that locality. He has also pointed out that patrol boats used by the Coast Guard have a draft of 5½ feet. Since the channel is only 6 feet deep, it allows very little clearance. The Commandant further stated that in heavy weather this condition becomes hazardous and at times may interfere with rescue operations. Thus the project cited doubtless would be advantageous to Coast Guard operations at this place.

Let me also point out that the Delaware Bay is one of the most important in the United States with respect to the tonnage of commercial shipping bound to and from the ports of Philadelphia, Pa., Camden, N. J., Baltimore, Md., Chester, Pa., and Wilmington, Del. Each of these commercial vessels of any considerable size takes on or discharges a bay and river pilot at Lewes, Del. The vessels used for transporting these pilots from shore to ship must use the inland waterway and the Roosevelt Inlet. Furthermore, at the location of this authorized Federal project, for which an appropriation of \$122,000 is sought, there is the second largest menhaden fishing industry in the United States. At present this industry is greatly handicapped by the lack of adequate depth of the channel at the Roosevelt Inlet and in the portion of the inland waterway to which I am referring.

Therefore, gentlemen, from the standpoint of national defense, including operations of the Army and the Coast Guard, and from the standpoint of seaborne commerce, commercial fishing industries, and distressed shipping, it is to be seriously doubted if there is any single project in the United States which can better justify an appropriation. In spite of that fact and the obvious justification for an appropriation for this necessary and important project, the appropriation request for \$122,000 was deleted by the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently, I now seek your support in having this item reinstated by the acceptance of the amendment which I have submitted.

Gentlemen, I sincerely believe that I have shown the necessity and the complete justification for the appropriation provided for by my amendment. Nevertheless, I want to use the remaining portion of the brief time allotted to me to give you some other startling facts which, as fair-minded men, I am sure you will consider. The State of Delaware is a small but extremely important and valuable State. It is for that reason that it is frequently referred to as the Diamond State. I am sure that the Treasury Department, and especially the Bureau of Internal Revenue, consider Delaware as the Diamond State. I make this statement because official statistics

of the Treasury Department reflect that the Federal Government collects in taxes slightly more than \$1,000 per capita from Delaware, whereas the average per capita Federal tax receipts throughout the Nation are only about \$280. In other words, gentlemen, the Federal tax receipts from Delaware are more than three and a half times the national average on a per capita basis. Treasury Department statistics also reflect that the average individual Federal income tax per capita in the United States is about \$140 per year. Compare this, please, with the fact that the average per capita individual Federal income tax derived from Delaware is about \$380 per year. In other words, the per capita Federal individual income tax return from Delaware is only slightly less than three times the national average.

Now you may ask why I have presented these figures, and I am only too happy to anticipate that question. Other statistics show that on the average each State receives in Federal grants to States and individuals \$13.57 for every \$100 of Federal taxes collected in the States. Delaware, which contributes out of all proportion to our tax revenues receives the smallest return in Federal grants. Delaware receives only \$3.25 in Federal grants for every \$100 it contributes to Federal tax revenues. On the other hand one State receives \$107 for each \$100 of Federal revenue.

The particular appropriation under consideration is for approximately \$187,000,000. Thirty-three States, in addition to Alaska and the District of Columbia, would share in that appropriation. Delaware is not one of those States even though the authorized Federal project for which my amendment provides an appropriation was approved by the Congress 5 years ago. In addition, gentlemen, the appropriation which I seek here today represents only slightly more than six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total amount of the rivers and harbors appropriation recommended by the committee. Let me repeat—six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the recommended appropriation.

Now it is probable that many of you gentlemen are saying, "Yes, but we cannot increase this appropriation. We must have economy. We must reduce, not increase appropriations." No one, Mr. Chairman, has been more outspoken on behalf of greater economy in government than I have, and I do not now propose to change that position by one iota.

Consequently, I direct your attention to page 250 of the committee's report on this appropriation measure. There in the fourth paragraph you will find the committee's statement that this recommended appropriation includes the amount of \$1,000,000 for "river and harbor studies," and another \$1,000,000 for "miscellaneous inspections, investigations, and so forth." In other words, the committee is recommending an appropriation of \$2,000,000 to be used in finding new river and harbor projects when we have before us a Federal project authorized 5 years ago which is considered by the Army, the Coast Guard,

and commercial interests as vitally important completely omitted from this appropriation. The appropriation which my amendment provides for is in the sum of \$122,000. Gentlemen, that sum represents only a little more than 6 percent of the \$2,000,000 which is carried in this bill for the study and investigation of projects. How, I ask you, can this be justified or considered in any manner to be consistent? Here in this \$2,000,000 for additional studies can be found without any increase in the total appropriation the complete sum of \$122,000 called for in my amendment and recommended as necessary by so many governmental and private interests.

As Delaware's sole representative, I know that I stand alone in this Chamber. You know that I have no powerful delegation to lend me support. You know that it is highly improbable that any other Member will seek time or take the effort to speak on this floor on behalf of my amendment. Therefore, I earnestly request that as fair-minded men seeking the greatest return from the funds which you are about to appropriate that you consider the facts which I have presented which serve to justify your support for my amendment.

And I may add, if the members of the committee will permit, that I can give full assurances that the entire Delaware delegation in the House favors this amendment and urges its adoption.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I find myself confronted with the entire delegation of the State of Delaware on this amendment which, together with the fact that the gentleman from Delaware is so beloved in the House, makes it difficult for me to proceed. This project falls in the category of those projects that there is no budget estimate for.

For the same reason that has been advanced several times today, the committee must be opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. Boggs].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard many times from this very able and hard-working subcommittee that because a project is new it sees fit not to include it in this year's estimate. I feel that there is a deep concern among many Members of this House, as well as myself, who have worthy projects that are much needed in their home districts, that have met all of the requirements and have been approved by the various Corps of Engineers, including the Chief of Engineers. I would like to make a very serious inquiry of the committee or some member thereof who may be informed. If there is a policy I would like to know when we may expect to get in some new projects.

Last year I appeared before this committee and explained the Pineville, Ky., project, where the people are almost destroyed every year by devastating floods. I received a very courteous hearing. The same procedure was repeated this year.

If there is a policy, or if the members of the subcommittee can advise myself and other Members of the House as to when we may receive consideration for new projects, I would like some member of that committee to advise us.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman repeat his request?

Mr. GOLDEN. I appeared before the gentleman's committee on two different occasions and received a very kind and a very courteous hearing on my Pineville, Ky., project. I realize that the committee has many serious obligations to meet. But I am in the same position that many other Members of this House are in. We have new projects that are worthy and that are badly needed, where our local communities have raised the money to furnish their part of the necessary funds to build these flood walls.

If a policy has been adopted by the gentleman's committee or if he could inform us when we may be able to successfully present our new projects, that information would be worth a great deal to the Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. First, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky that it is true he has been very diligent for his district before the committee. He came and presented all of the facts in reference to his project and he presented them in a most praiseworthy manner. But in view of the monetary situation of the country at this time, the existing deficit, and the deficit spending that is going on, the committee has taken a firm position against some projects. The gentleman knows as a legislator here that we cannot bind future committees and we cannot bind future Congresses.

Mr. GOLDEN. I realize that.

Mr. RABAUT. We are going to make no hard-and-fast rule about this. We did think that as a business proposition this year we should simply stand by and take stock of the great work that is being done all over the country by the Army engineers and that no new plans or projects this year be considered.

Mr. GOLDEN. I would like to point out to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I have no endeavor to undertake to bind the committee. I just simply ask if there has been any thought given to the need for new projects and as to when we may be considered.

A year's delay may mean the destruction of the town, and if there is any information that the gentleman can give us that would throw light on that, I would appreciate it. We have to answer to our constituents, and we are vitally interested.

Mr. RABAUT. Of course, the procedure is to present this matter to the Bureau of the Budget. The engineers first present this to the Bureau, and sometimes the Bureau sees fit to approve

and forward it to the Congress, and at other times they do not. So, that is the first hurdle that the gentleman must overcome.

Mr. GOLDEN. I want to say to the Members of the House that some time I hope to get this project through. We have annual damages in Pineville, Ky., that are in excess of the entire cost to build a flood wall around that town of about 4,000 people. My town has already voted bonds. Something over one-third of the cost has been apportioned to the local citizens, and we voted \$490,000 of bonds, and we are hoping that before long, before another flood strikes, that we may find our financial affairs in such shape that we can approve of this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what has been said about commencing new projects in view of the present financial condition of the United States Treasury. However, I would like to ask the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee whether he feels enough money has been appropriated in this bill to take care of emergency flood-control measures. I make special reference to emergency work required on the Missouri River in the section designated in the report as Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska.

Mr. RABAUT. \$3,000,000 has been appropriated.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am particularly concerned about great damage which may result to Gordon Drive on United States Highway No. 77 at Sioux City. This is a highway recently constructed by the Iowa State Highway Department along the Iowa bank of the Missouri River at Sioux City. During the ice run this spring, which was one of the heaviest in years, approximately 830 feet of the pile structure protecting this road was completely destroyed and the river was threatening about 1,500 feet of highway fill immediately shoreward and downstream from this structure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I know of that damage. We had more water there than we had in 1943. That is right across the river from my district. On my side of the river we had approximately a million dollars worth of damage. Now, this \$3,000,000 for emergency is an over-all emergency fund. Very little of that could be used on the Missouri River, although the engineers did go up there and do some sand bagging and gave some relief. But, the damage is there, and

very little of this \$3,000,000 is going to be applicable to give these people the relief they need now in the emergency.

Mr. HOEVEN. That is the very point I want to make. The \$3,000,000 would not seem sufficient in view of the fact that this amount is all that is allowed for flood emergencies all over the country.

Mr. STEFAN. It is an emergency appropriation for emergencies all over the United States.

Mr. HOEVEN. So the proportionate part which could be allocated for Missouri River emergency work might prove very insignificant indeed.

Mr. STEFAN. It is very, very small.

Mr. HOEVEN. The Iowa State Highway Commission has invested a lot of money in the construction of Gordon Drive, to which project Sioux City has also contributed. This highway adjacent to the Missouri River is threatened with being washed out whenever the Missouri goes on a rampage. Twice within the last 2 years the Army engineers at Omaha have been called upon to construct emergency work for the protection of this very road. It is a hazard which must be taken care of.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Iowa and the rest of us along the river have been working on this problem from the very minute the matter was called to our attention. We got busy when we learned of the breaking up of the ice jam in North Dakota. The Army engineers have been on the job, but the subsequent damage is there today. We are getting complaints from our constituents all up and down that river.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is correct and he also realizes that there is a great investment of money involved. There should be some assurance on the part of subcommittee or the Congress, at least, that we are going to have enough money in the emergency fund to take care of the very things the gentleman from Nebraska and I have mentioned.

Mr. STEFAN. This is a real emergency.

Mr. HOEVEN. What is the Congress going to do about it?

Mr. STEFAN. I understand the Army engineers are willing to help all they can, but how much of this \$3,000,000 can we get now?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is the question. I took the matter up with the district engineer at Omaha, who contends he does not have enough money to take care of all these emergency needs along the Missouri River. We are absolutely subject to the whims of nature and the weather and never know how much damage we are going to have when the river rushes down upon us.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman's statement on the floor should induce the Army engineers to give some more of that \$3,000,000 where it is needed, where the emergency now exists.

Mr. HOEVEN. I do hope the Army engineers will disburse the funds where needed the most. However, requests for assistance come from all over the United States to participate in this \$3,000,000.

Just where it is to be allocated we never know. It is our duty to speak up for our individual needs. I want to impress upon the subcommittee that if Gordon Drive at Sioux City again comes into immediate danger and adequate emergency funds are not available that I may be called upon to ask for some emergency legislation to help solve our problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including printing and binding, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, and for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with the flood control, \$341,055,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, chapter IX of the bill under consideration covering civil functions of the Department of the Army under the heading of "Flood control, general" includes an item for flood control at Hutchinson, Kans.

This project is designed to protect the city of Hutchinson and adjacent territory from recurring flood damage from Cow Creek, a tributary of the Arkansas River which flows into that river near Hutchinson. The project as approved by the Army engineers will protect 17,500 acres of land having a value of \$64,000,000 exclusive of annual crops. Six thousand acres of the 17,500 are in the city of Hutchinson. Recurring floods have occurred for many years and a number of them have been quite disastrous. The records of the Army engineers show that especially disastrous floods occurred in 1929 and in 1941. The 1929 flood caused estimated damages of \$2,500,000 and that occurring in 1941 damages of \$2,000,000. Over the years there has been some flood damage at least every 3 years and major floods have occurred approximately every 9 or 10 years during the period from 1877 down to date as shown by the records of the Army engineers.

The total estimated Federal cost of this project is \$3,030,000 of which \$1,460,000 has been allotted previous to the coming fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of \$750,000 for 1951, which, if made, would leave \$870,000 necessary to complete the project after the fiscal year

1951. No funds were appropriated for the fiscal year 1950.

This project is the result of plans which have been under consideration for several years. In 1945 the Army engineers submitted plans to the city of Hutchinson and these plans were approved by the city and in the same year the city gave its assurances to the Secretary of War covering that part of the project and its costs which were to be assumed by the city.

The project has also been approved by the chief engineer of the Division of Water Resources of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture. Since the project will require the relocation of State highways and the construction of bridges and culverts, it has been necessary to work with the State highway commission, and that commission has agreed to carry out the necessary construction work needed to relocate highways and build culverts and bridges.

However, considerable delay occurred in connection with the project, due to a legal action brought against the city of Hutchinson by the Cow Creek Valley Flood Prevention Association, composed of landowners who felt they would be adversely affected by the construction of the project. This litigation was not finally concluded until January 1949. The decision was in favor of the city, and since that time rapid progress has been made.

Pursuant to the agreement between the city and the Army engineers, the city of Hutchinson has proceeded to obtain rights-of-way for the project and to date has issued its temporary notes for land acquisition and damages in the amount of \$429,812.37. The city has also contracted to pay for the relocation where necessary of the facilities of the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., the Kansas Power & Light Co., the Consolidated Gas Utilities Corp., and the Gas Service Co., and is expected to spend in this connection not to exceed \$139,867.79.

It is my understanding that if the amount of \$750,000 called for in the budget estimate is made available, work on the project including the relocation of railroad lines, the cost of which is to be paid by the Government, the construction of earthworks and dikes, the relocation of the utilities mentioned above and the relocation of highways by the State highway commission will proceed without interruption and toward early completion. The appropriation of the full amount of \$750,000 will not only permit the Army engineers to relocate the railroad lines involved but will enable them to let a continuing contract for the construction of the earthwork necessary to complete the project. If the amount is reduced to \$400,000 as recommended in the report of the House committee it will mean that contracts for only a very small portion of the earthwork can be let for the coming fiscal year and that the Army engineers will not feel justified in letting continuing contracts. While this will not affect the ultimate completion of the project in any way, it will delay it for at least a year and it is felt by the municipal officials of the city of Hutchinson

that this delay may result in increased costs to the city on its part of the project. I think I should point out also that in view of the history of recurring floods in the Cow Creek area there is a possibility that the delay might result in serious flood damage to the city of Hutchinson.

For that reason the mayor and commissioners of the city of Hutchinson are much concerned about the delay which will be caused by this reduction of \$350,000 made by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and on April 7 last adopted a resolution with reference to the matter urging that proper steps be taken to secure the appropriation of sufficient funds by the Congress to construct the project. As a part of my remarks I include herewith a copy of the resolution to which I have just referred and urge its most careful consideration by the House and the Senate in connection with the appropriations for flood control contained in this bill:

Whereas the city of Hutchinson, Kans., by resolution duly adopted on the 27th day of August 1943, directed its city engineer to contact the proper officials and engineers of the United States Army and endeavor to obtain their assistance and cooperation in the development and construction of the city's flood control project; and

Whereas on the 14th day of March 1945, Colonel Wilson and his staff of the United States Army engineers presented their flood control plans for flood protection for the city of Hutchinson, Kans., and the city approved said plans; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson made assurances pledging compliances with the conditions of local cooperation in accordance with the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, which authorized the improvement and construction of levees on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Arkansas River, to protect people and property, and the Secretary of War approved the assurances on July 4, 1945; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson has procured through condemnation and eminent domain, gift, or purchase rights-of-way, easements, and exclusive occupancy and possession over, through, and upon the parts of rights-of-way described and known as lot II of the Hutchinson flood control project as approved by the chief engineer of the division of water resources; and

Whereas the city in acquiring such rights-of-way has expended the sum of \$429,812.37 issuing its temporary notes to obtain such funds; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson has granted rights of entry to the lands so condemned for flood-control purposes by the city of Hutchinson, Kans., to the United States Government; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson has taken all other necessary steps requisite to comply with local cooperation requirements as set forth in the Flood Control Act approved by the Congress of the United States the 22d day of June 1936; and

Whereas special counsel for the city of Hutchinson has announced that upon inquiry to the district engineer of the Tulsa district, Corps of Engineers, that moneys currently appropriated for the Hutchinson flood-control project plus those proposed for appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 by the House Appropriation Committee would be inadequate to permit the award of a contract during the fiscal year 1951 for work on the levee portions of the project; and

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the City of Hutchinson, Kans., deem it necessary for the public good and convenience that

the bridges, streets, alleys, public buildings, public property, public utilities, and private property located within the corporate limits of the city of Hutchinson, Kans., be protected from overflow from streams and natural water courses and general flooded conditions and that the Hutchinson flood control project be constructed without further delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Hutchinson, Kans.—

SECTION 1. That the Congressmen and Senators from the State of Kansas be requested to take all necessary and proper steps to procure the appropriation of sufficient funds by the Congress of the United States to enable the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army to construct the Hutchinson flood-control project.

SEC. 2. That the city clerk of the city of Hutchinson shall forward forthwith a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Congressmen and Senators of the State of Kansas.

Passed and approved this 7th day of April A. D. 1950.

L. E. BAIRD, Mayor.
FRED HENNEY,
WM. C. SHAW, Jr.,
J. W. VANDAVERE,
RICHARD BELTZER,
City Commissioners.

Attest:

F. C. SMITH, City Clerk.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: On page 339, line 1, strike out "\$241,055,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$343,055,000."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before you provides \$2,000,000 for planning for "Flood control, general." The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$4,000,000. This is half of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Last week the Congress passed a flood-control bill in the amount of approximately \$1,700,000,000. If this amendment is not adopted, there will not be a dime for plans and specifications for "Flood control, general" because in the bill before you the amounts have been specifically assigned. I am sure the committee wishes to be fair. If you will consider reclamation, which is the counterpart of flood control, you will find the committee allotted \$5,150,000 for plans and specifications whereas the Corps of Army Engineers under "Flood control, general," is not allowed one dime for planning.

Unless this amendment is adopted, you are certainly going to paralyze the activities of the Corps of Army Engineers and these new projects about which you have spoken this afternoon will not have funds for plans and specifications. This is a reasonable amendment. It does not necessarily affect my State because most of the flood-control funds for my State are provided in the appropriations for the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries, and that includes planning. I urge you to support this amendment because you have provided, as I have just stated, \$5,150,000 for reclamation. That covers 17 States, whereas "Flood control, general" covers the entire United States. Members of the committee, I certainly hope you will support this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on April 5, shortly after general debate on the comprehensive bill began, I made a statement respecting the appropriations for civil functions and pointed out that while personally there were no rivers and harbors projects in the district I represent, and there are no general flood-control projects in my district, I felt, in response to the requests of many of my colleagues on both sides of the chamber, that as chairman of the Committee on Public Works I should make a statement, especially respecting planning funds.

In that statement I urged this subcommittee, voluntarily reminding them that I had generally supported them in their bills for appropriations through the years, to make provision for planning both for rivers and harbors and for general flood-control work, because in the pending report of the committee it had been stated that no provisions were made for planning for rivers and harbors and general flood control. I then called, as I now call, attention to the language of the paragraph of the bill under consideration which is the identical language carried in the appropriation for the current fiscal year, Public Law 355, Eighty-first Congress. That language includes planning. The bill includes planning. Yet the report of the committee said no funds are included for planning. I do insist, in all fairness to the committee and the membership of the House, that this matter should be clarified, although the language of the bill, if different from the report, will control. Furthermore, I say if this House is to allow, as they have done in this comprehensive bill, substantially \$5,000,000 for planning for reclamation when the Interior bill carries \$297,000,000 for construction of reclamation projects, there is no reason why there should not be a provision for planning for general flood control. That is the situation. They may have the right to continue to plan for the projects which are under construction without any additional authorization, and these funds can be used for such planning. If, as the chairman of the subcommittee maintains, the language of the bill rather than the report of the committee controls, the planning is authorized, with no limits on the amount as there is no limitation of the amount in the breakdown in the report of the committee.

The paragraph on rivers and harbors contains no language authorizing planning, and the report states that no provision is made for planning for rivers and harbors. The bill must be amended in the other body to provide for such planning. The pending paragraph for general flood control authorizes and provides for planning funds. The report states that no funds are authorized. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], I believe, will state before the consideration of the chapter on civil functions is concluded, that the language of the bill rather than the language of the report will control. I agree. I believe such to be the intent of the Congress. Provision, therefore, will be made for planning for general flood

control, but there will be no limit on the amount that may be used as would be the case if the Passman amendment were adopted. I ask for clarification, but under the language of the bill, the funds appropriated without any limitation as has always been the case, may be used for planning.

Under the terms of the bill, the appropriations for the Mississippi River and tributaries and for the Sacramento River may be used for planning. But I say to the membership that no other projects, emergency or otherwise, except those embraced in this bill and that are under construction, can be planned, without planning funds.

I call attention to this language in the bill. The bill itself provides for planning in this language, and I read from page 339, line 1:

*Provided, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River in Alaska. * * **

Provided further, That the funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys and prepare plans and specifications necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized.

That is exactly the language that was carried in the act for the current year when \$3,000,000, as I recall, was given in the break-down for planning. Unless we mean to stop all future general flood control, unless we mean to scrap substantially the staff of experts that is now assembled in the Corps of Engineers, Congress should provide funds for planning. I do urge the committee, where there has been a recommendation by the budget for \$4,000,000, to approve the rather small appropriation—smaller than that carried for the current year—contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. I repeat, no matter what State or what district you represent, unless this amendment is agreed to, or unless the committee itself clarifies the language of the report, that no other project in the future, until plans have been made, can be appropriated for.

Keep in mind that there will remain, after the passage of the pending bill, authorizations for general flood control amounting to approximately \$343,000,000, which is substantially the amount carried in the pending bill for general flood control. In the general public interest I think the committee would do well definitely and in a definite amount to appropriate for planning, thus clarifying the language in the report.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in economy, but I am interested in sound, sensible economy.

News releases have been carrying many items concerning the floods in Minnesota this spring. We have had a very severe and very disastrous flood condition. Aitkin County in my district at the present time is faced with the most severe flood in the history of that county. Fifty thousand acres flooded, 487 miles of county and State-aid and 812 miles of those township roads are

badly damaged. Last week a farm home burned because the fire apparatus was unable to get to this farmhouse, with water all around it; yet it was impossible to put the fire out.

The damage done to property at this time is immeasurable, as far as monetary cost is concerned.

We had a severe flood in 1948, almost as severe as the flood we are having this year. The cost in relief, the cost to the Army engineers in moving people out of the area, the cost to the State and Federal Governments in providing feed for the livestock and providing housing for the people are costly. Taxpayers' money spent for this purpose is expensive. Taxpayers' money spent to solve the situation can be a saving.

We have worked in that area for a number of years in an attempt to relieve that situation. Last year the appropriation bill carried the sum of \$25,000 for planning. This year the Bureau of the Budget figured that \$50,000 would be needed to complete that planning. That is a total of only \$75,000 for planning. Now, will this \$25,000 be lost because we do not complete the job? Will we be faced with the possibility of delaying this flood-control work that is needed in that area? The cost of the floods in 2 years has been far more than the cost of building this particular project.

We can save the situation by some sensible planning, and I appeal to you in connection with this item of restoring planning for flood control to proceed cautiously and do some of these things at a time when it is economical to do them. I am sure that is what the gentleman from Louisiana intended when he talked about the item being put back. It would make this fund include just such projects as I have mentioned on which some planning has already been started. This would enable the Army engineers to retain their experienced technical staff to complete the work started.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. The Budget requested \$4,000,000 for planning under "Flood control, general." My amendment provides only \$2,000,000. I am cooperating with the Committee on Appropriations trying to effect economy. I think it is a very sound investment. It is my understanding, according to the language in the bill at this time that if this amendment is not adopted all of the projects will have to be placed on the shelf until at some future date the Congress appropriates money for additional plans and specifications.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is the way I understood the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana. I am heartily in support of it. I believe it will help the situation. I merely want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that it will be a saving and an economy to proceed with this work of planning now and keep the experienced personnel on the job.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. When the gentleman speaks of adding \$4,000,000, is that in addition to the \$341,055,000 carried in the bill?

Mr. MARSHALL. I will let the gentleman from Louisiana answer that.

Mr. PASSMAN. It merely adds \$2,000,000 for planning which will be used for plans and specifications, not \$4,000,000. I am in hopes no amendment will be offered to my amendment to increase it to \$4,000,000, for I think we can get along very nicely on the \$2,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS as a substitute for the Passman amendment: Page 339, line 1, strike out "\$341,055,000" and insert "\$345,055,000."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not against the Passman amendment, but I do believe that \$4,000,000 is not a large amount of money for planning. The engineers tell me they are working on some 60 to 65 projects. They will need this money if they are to continue this work. I call attention to the fact that already this portion of the bill has been cut 25 percent, whereas the rest of the bill has received an average over-all cut of only 5 percent. Even if we appropriate every cent the Budget recommends in this chapter of the bill we will still be cut more than 20 percent over other chapters of the bill. Therefore, I say to you it is going to be difficult to take 50 percent of the \$4,000,000 which the Budget recommends and divide that between 60 or 65 projects and keep it within the allocation in such way that the planning can be economically carried on to completion. So I offer this substitute to stand by the Budget recommendation for planning, if for no other purpose in the flood-control chapter. The Budget in recommending the \$4,000,000 recognized that the engineers badly need this for this work.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allowed me be given to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe that most of the taxpayers of this country fully realize that flood control, irrigation, navigation, and electric power provided by multiple-purpose projects are essential to the development of the

economy of this country. This is not money wasted, and regardless of how strongly you may feel toward curtailing governmental expenditures, it is absolutely necessary that we go forward on our flood-control projects if we expect to utilize, preserve, and maintain the fine soil that is and could be made available to the people.

Lack of flood control upon any river of any importance in this country is destroying yearly billions of dollars in property and in soil. Human suffering should be considered in these matters. I do sincerely feel that we should not at this particular time say to the world: "We are not going to have any more planning money. The engineers are going to do nothing in the future. They are going to sit back, and," as the subcommittee chairman said, "take stock of what they have been doing in the past and let the people's land continue to be washed down the river."

I cannot feel that the Congress believes we should not appropriate planning funds so that we can go forward with this program. I hate to mention this, but it is the truth. I have not been so strong for foreign aid since I have come here. I campaigned on the theory that there was some need for our "dishing out" some money to help those democracies overseas that had helped us in time of need. I still feel that way, but I have not yet been able to justify the enormous expenditures, knowing that a great deal of the money is not going where it has been intended in the foreign program. You folks do know that a great deal of money we have given to those governments overseas is being used for the very purpose that the Congress today is being told that the people of this country should be denied. That is exactly right.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Right along that line the committee might be interested in a weekly summary of developments in the Economic Cooperation Administration prepared by the Public Advisory Board of April 7, this year, in which it is stated:

Seventeen districts in Sicily have received a total allocation of 2,673,321,000 lire (equivalent to \$4,277,300) to finance land reclamation projects, the ECA Special Mission to Italy has announced. The projects will include construction of drainage ditches and a vast irrigation network. Aqueducts and some country roads are to be built and work is to be done for stream control in the area. Including this allocation, Sicily has received a total of 526,569,696,000 lire (equivalent to \$8,425,100) for land reclamation projects to date.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask you, Can you conscientiously tell your people: "No; you go on and be drowned when the rains come. We are going to give our aid to the people overseas?" You think it is economy and the papers are going to say: "Look at those people down there. They are voting economy for a change." Curtailment of money for flood-control planning for the benefit of our people is false economy.

We are not allowed to question one penny when the ECA program is under consideration, but when we are considering the welfare of our own people, all the newspapers rather enjoy referring to any flood-control projects as pork-barrel legislation. I do not give a hoot what the newspapers say. I believe that the floods of this country should be curbed, and it is foolish not to curb them. For this committee to take the arbitrary position that the activities of the Army engineers should be hampered is a short-sighted proposal. The Army engineers make up one of the most outstanding organizations of our Government, rendering vital services to our people. Their program is to build, protect, maintain, and preserve our natural resources. Do you think for 1 minute that the Army engineers will not continue to spend money in the future just as they have in the past? You are just prohibiting them from doing something worth while. That is about what it amounts to.

Now, gentlemen, let us be serious about this thing. It just so happens that my little State of Arkansas is situated on the banks of the Mississippi. Enormous quantities of water flow through the State of Arkansas to the Mississippi, thereby greatly affecting my area of the State and portions of the States of Mississippi and Louisiana as the water flows to the sea.

Since the north and northeastern portions of the United States, along with some other sections of our country have been pretty well taken care of on flood-control projects in the past, those sections should not arbitrarily decide at this time to curtail the efforts of the southern portions of this great country from rendering a like service to our people.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. This particular amendment in the sum of \$2,000,000 provides for planning throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. TACKETT. That is right. That is exactly right. I shall vote for the Passman amendment and I shall also vote for the Brooks amendment, for the simple reason that the Passman amendment merely asks for half of what the Bureau of the Budget says we should have and the Brooks amendment is just asking for what the Bureau of the Budget has requested.

I want to tell you something, when we go before the Appropriations Committee and we do not have the Budget Bureau with us, the committee says, "We cannot listen to you; we cannot tolerate an unbudgeted request; the Budget Bureau is not with you"; but when the Bureau of the Budget approves flood-control projects, then we are advised that the committee cannot agree with the Bureau of the Budget. The lack of approval by the Bureau of the Budget is used by the committee to refuse an appropriation for a worthy project, while a budget-approved request is denied upon the theory that the budget is wrong.

Truthfully, gentlemen, we are spending too much on foreign aid while allowing our own natural resources to deteriorate. We should spend less on foreign aid and less for the welfare of our own economy while balancing the budget. Construction of flood-control projects is a humanitarian effort to preserve life, property, and natural resources, and is one of the greatest national defense moves. We are willing to take our share in appropriation cuts for economy purposes, but surely the flood-control projects should not take all the cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the last speaker that the budget figure, I would say 99 percent of the time, is always considered as the ceiling figure. The Committee on Appropriations has always treated it in such a fashion. Further, I hope that no others here will be making a comparison about spending at home for local projects and spending abroad for the preservation of the world and the winning of the cold war. That has been explained so many times on this House floor and in the press that I do not feel it ought to be brought in here and made another part of this controversy today.

Now, the situation is the same here. The House treated these projects as consistently as they treated the rivers and harbors program a few moments ago. So often we hear the remark made, "We are for economy, but; we are for economy, but." Now, we are either for economy or we are not for economy; either we forget or we remember the debt of the United States.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is talking about economy. It seems we can have flood control and irrigation in Europe but cannot have it in this country.

Mr. RABAUT. Variety of opinion makes a horse race.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Right now the "but" is only \$4,000,000; that is all.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that the committee provided planning money for reclamation, but would not allow planning money for flood control?

Mr. RABAUT. We do not have charge of the reclamation projects, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am speaking of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RABAUT. All right, but do not load me with the whole Appropriations Committee. I have charge on the floor of this work of the Army engineers, set out in this particular chapter of the bill. The other chapters of the bill are not controlled by this subcommittee, and the

gentleman knows it well. That is just muddying the waters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will show its consistency again and defeat this amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PASSMAN) there were—ayes 29, noes 45.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: On page 339, insert before the period in line 14 a colon and the following: "Provided further, That in the allocation for individual flood-control projects of funds appropriated herein, the rate of reduction in the fiscal year 1951 budget estimates for individual flood-control projects shall be the same for all such projects."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for withholding his point of order. I believe he ought to accept this amendment. It follows exactly the procedure the distinguished chairman brought before this House in this same appropriation bill last year.

The purpose of my amendment is not to increase the amount of money appropriated herein. It is not to add any new projects or any new works. My amendment boils down to this: That all the projects carried in the bill shall all be treated alike. Frankly, I believe there would be a better way and that would be to first give the necessary money to those projects that could be completed in the next fiscal year and thus bring protection to life and property. That procedure has not been followed. No such formula has been presented to the committee. Therefore, I believe the fairest thing to do would be to treat all projects in all sections of the country and in all States in the same manner.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Under such a provision, with an equal division of the money, the Garrison Dam and the other dam which would be completed in 2 or 3 years would perhaps be completed in a year or even sooner, so that they could hold the water up above the river and prevent the disastrous floods that have occurred around Sioux City this year.

Mr. CURTIS. That may be true. I am not quite familiar with those projects.

Mr. STEFAN. I am talking about Garrison and Randall.

Mr. CURTIS. It would help all projects that have been cut more than 25 percent.

Mr. Chairman, the project I have in mind is one on the Republican River where they have disastrous floods and where the loss of life on one occasion exceeded 100 persons in a single year. As late as 1947, 15 lives were lost on that river.

If the Harlan County Dam were to receive the full budget estimate, the opening of the dam could be completed this fiscal year, thereby holding back these floodwaters and protecting the lives and property of the people there. That project, even though it is near completion, has been cut 33 1/3 percent. Other projects have been cut a mere token 2 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent. There is no reason that can be offered as to why some projects should receive a punitive cut and others little or no cut at all. I sincerely hope this amendment can be adopted. It merely provides that the same percentage cut shall apply to all streams and all States and all sections of the country. It is in the interest of sound and orderly procedure. I think it is fair. In the absence of any systematic working out of a plan whereby a project nearing completion might have sufficient funds for its completion, I think that we should treat them all alike.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$18,000,000 for the Harlan County Dam. If that amount had been provided in the bill the opening of the dam could have been closed in this next fiscal year. This bill carries the sum of \$12,000,000 for this project. Should a flood of the proportions of some of our past floods occur on the Republican River, much of the work already in, might be destroyed. It should also be pointed out that by delaying the completion of this dam a year there will be an added estimated cost to the administrative expense of a quarter of a million dollars. My amendment, while not increasing the total amount for all flood control would make one and one-half million more dollars available for the Harlan County Dam.

Mr. Chairman, may I also take this occasion to comment upon the Red Willow Dam to be built in the Republican River. This is one of the five tributary dams which was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944 for construction by either the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. By interdepartmental agreement it has been decided that the Army should build it. It is not a new and separate project. It would be a part of the Frenchman-Cambridge project now under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Red Willow Dam is very necessary to protect the irrigation works now being built in the Republican Valley from disastrous floods. There have been times that the floodwaters from the Red Willow have caused damage in the valley of the main stream of the river as far down as Oxford, Nebr. It is hoped that this work

can be approved by the Bureau of the Budget and that funds can be provided to get this important part of the Frenchman-Cambridge project under way.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

I fail to see where a point of order should lie against the amendment. It appeals to me as an amendment that is very much in keeping with the rules of the House. Amendments of like nature have been adopted by this House on numerous occasions in the past. So I hope the gentleman's point of order will not be sustained.

I agree with what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has said about the project in his district. All up and down the Missouri River Valley in our section of that great valley, we have just experienced another terrific annual flood that washed out agricultural levees no end, the floodwaters pouring down on us from that huge watershed upstream broke through and flooded hundreds of thousands of acres of the finest land that lies out of doors. I can assure you, my colleagues, that the people of my district, like the people of every district in the Missouri Valley, especially in the lower reaches, are not shouting for joy because of the action taken by this committee, which has reduced the request of the Bureau of the Budget for flood control in the neighborhood of 28 percent. The Democratic leadership of the Interior Department Subcommittee also saw fit, against my wishes, to take 10 percent off of the budget request for the Missouri Valley, while at the same time they scarcely touched any of the other reclamation projects. It seems we are to be used as a sort of whipping boy in that valley, and we do not like it especially in light of the fact that the spending party in power are demanding billions to spend for all kinds of worthless things.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. It does seem to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is a fair one; that it does not increase the appropriation but equalizes the amount. I feel that what the gentleman is saying will really mean that these emergency dams, such as Garrison, and others, will be given a little more speed so that they may be finished in order to hold back the water so that we do not continually get these disastrous floods.

Mr. JENSEN. Right. Every Member of Congress wants to be fair. I feel sure if he or she are permitted to vote their own convictions they would support this amendment. The laws of our land are based on common sense and fairness. When a law goes beyond that, that law soon falls flat or at least that used to be the case when we operated on a square-deal basis. This amendment certainly is based on fairness and equality of treatment to the people affected in this bill.

So I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I talked to Colonel Potter, of the Army engineers, just a few minutes ago, and he tells me there is yet

thousands of acres of land under water in my district even though the high flood crest has passed and which will not drain off until outlet ditches are dug. It is going to take a lot of the farmers' own dollars to get that water off the land in order to put it into crops this year. Many acres will not be cultivated this crop year because of the fact the farmers cannot get the water off of that land in time to put in the crops.

The only assistance the United States Army Engineers can give those farmers is to help repair and rebuild those levees. Where they have drainage districts established and a request is made to the Army engineers for the rebuilding of those levees, the engineers have only the authority to repair them, to put them back in the same shape they were before the flood; but they have no authority to enlarge, or strengthen, or heighten the levees which were built by the people themselves. The money provided in this bill is to build strong permanent levees to hold future floodwaters off this valuable farm land.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read into the Record the justifications for agricultural levees on the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth which appears on pages 247 to 249 of the hearings. The budget request was for \$7,000,000, the committee reduced it to \$5,000,000. Also I want to read into the Record the hearings on the Little Sioux flood-control project. For the Little Sioux the Bureau of the Budget requested \$500,000. The committee cut this right square in half. Certainly we are not treating the people of the Missouri Valley fairly and equitably in those instances.

In all fairness, this amendment should be adopted. Please give us a square deal.

LITTLE SIOUX RIVER, IOWA

Mr. KERR. Item No. 42 is Little Sioux River, Iowa. Total estimated Federal cost, \$4,100,000; allotments to date, \$572,100; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, \$500,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, \$3,027,900; 1950 appropriation, \$372,100.

Colonel POTTER. Little Sioux River is in the Missouri Basin on the Iowa side. This is a project we are asking \$500,000 for, to continue channel work.

Mr. RABAUT. You have quite a few floods there, it says here.

Colonel POTTER. Floodwaters come down out of the hills. A lot of farms are up on the hills, sir, and then they extend down to this very broad flat land that goes down to the river. It is a cooperative project, between ourselves and the Soil Conservation Service. They are doing the upstream work and we are seeing that the water gets down the river without damage.

Major floods have occurred on this river 16 times since 1851.

Mr. TABER. May I ask, have you got a complete record of them?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; we have.

Mr. TABER. How much have you obligated? Mr. BOUSQUET. \$456,900; and that is scheduled for obligation in March.

FALL RIVER RESERVOIR, KANS.

Mr. TABER. Is it not completed now?

Colonel POTTER. It has been in operation since it was dedicated last fall. Governor Carlson came to the dedication.

Mr. TABER. And they are going to put in a crane for operation?

Colonel POTTER. \$23,000 to complete purchase of a crane for gate operation and \$17,-

000 for construction of facilities for reservoir management and public use.

Mr. TABER. How much of an unobligated balance have you got?

Mr. BOUSQUET. \$489,000, sir.

Mr. TABER. It is all gone?

Colonel POTTER. It is all scheduled for obligation this fiscal year, sir.

Mr. KERR. Fall River Reservoir, that does not call for anything; that is continued.

HUTCHINSON, ARKANSAS RIVER, KANS.

Now, the next one is No. 44, Hutchinson, Arkansas River, Kans., total estimated Federal cost, \$3,080,000; allotments to date, \$1,480,000; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, \$750,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, \$870,000; 1950 appropriation, none.

You are requesting \$750,000. Justify that, Colonel.

Colonel POTTER. This \$750,000 will finish lot II of the project, except for relocations. We propose to use it as follows: Earthwork, \$325,900; relocations, \$424,100.

I might bring out for the record that the floods of 1929 and 1941 caused estimated damages of \$2,500,000 and \$2,000,000, respectively.

This is a project where considerable time elapsed in the local interests getting together. We believe that it is all straightened out now.

Mr. TABER. How much is unobligated?

Mr. BOUSQUET. \$859,000 as of November 30.

Mr. TABER. When is that scheduled?

Mr. BOUSQUET. That is scheduled for obligation in January and May; \$500,000 in January, and \$354,000 in May.

Mr. TABER. That will pretty near finish it; won't it?

Mr. BOUSQUET. That will just about take care of our unobligated balance.

Mr. TABER. How will it finish the job?

Mr. BOUSQUET. The contract on which we are obligating \$500,000 in January, is going to cost us \$868,000. And \$522,000 is the estimated cost of the work obligated in May. They will be continuing contracts.

Mr. TABER. Well, that \$750,000 will finish it.

Colonel POTTER. It will require \$870,000 more after 1951 to finish the entire project.

KANSAS CITYS, MO. AND KANS.

Mr. KERR. Item No. 45, Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans., total estimated Federal cost, \$41,389,000; allotments to date, \$24,912,100; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, \$7,000,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, \$9,476,900; 1950 appropriation, \$5,000,000.

You are requesting \$7,000,000 more for 1951 fiscal. What do you have to say about that?

Mr. TABER. How much?

Mr. BOUSQUET. January of 1950, \$525,000. And December of 1949, \$1,873,000.

Mr. KERR. What about the account obligated for December 1949?

Mr. BOUSQUET. Our latest records are as of the 30th of November, sir. About the fifteenth or sixteenth of this month we should be getting our figures for December.

Colonel POTTER. It takes about 10 or 15 days for those reports to come in after the end of the month, Judge.

MISSOURI RIVER AGRICULTURAL LEVEES, SIOUX CITY, IOWA, TO THE MOUTH

Mr. KERR. Item No. 46, "Missouri River agricultural levees Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth." Total estimated Federal cost, \$119,700,000; allotments to date, \$21,622,700; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, \$7,000,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, \$91,077,300; 1950 appropriations, \$5,952,700.

Colonel, what have you to say in justification?

Colonel POTTER. The entire project's scheme is made up of over 100 separate levee units

roughly corresponding to the levee organizations that presently exist along this river.

The river is subject to flood, and the entire valley is subject to flood, I would say, once out of every 3 or 4 years.

To protect themselves on a valley which ranges up to 5 miles wide, the local people have formed together into drainage and levee units.

Based on the 1941 and 1944 Flood Control Acts, we have worked together with these local units in forming Federal flood-protection projects, several of which are under way at the present time.

The moneys we are requesting this year will provide for the continuation of levee units already under construction, the alteration of highways and bridges, and the completion of some of the units already under construction.

Mr. TABER. How many acres would be protected by this protection?

Colonel POTTER. About a million and a half acres, sir; 50 communities; and the flood of 1947 caused damages of \$65,000,000 in this particular stretch of the river.

The people are constantly faced with this threat, and I have seen them plant, be flooded, replant, and be flooded out again.

Mr. TABER. What is your unobligated balance there?

Mr. BOUSQUET. The unobligated balance on November 30, 1949, was \$5,548,400. And that is scheduled for obligation in December, January, February, March, and April.

Colonel POTTER. Each one of these units, or a part of the unit, will be advertised as a separate contract.

Mr. KERR. Without objection, we will put pages 464, 465, 466, and 467 in the record.

(The pages referred to are as follows:)

"Justification of estimate

"Item No. 46, Missouri River agricultural levees Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth:

Total estimated Federal cost.....	\$119,700,000
Allotments to date.....	21,622,700
Tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951.....	7,000,000
Additional to complete after fiscal year 1951....	91,077,300

"1950 appropriation: \$5,952,700.

"Authorization: 1941 and 1944 Flood Control Acts.

"Location and description: The project consists of a series of levees and appurtenant works along both sides of the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth, for the protection of agricultural lands and small communities against floods.

"Status: Construction of unit L-575 levees has been completed. Raising and alteration of C. B. & Q. Railroad Plum Creek Bridge (unit L-575) has been completed. Raising and alteration of the C. B. & Q. Railroad Nishnabotna River Bridge (unit L-575) is 12 percent complete and will be about 50 percent complete on June 30, 1950. Construction of underseepage facilities for unit L-575 are 25 percent complete and will be 80 percent complete on June 30, 1950. Construction of unit R-562 levees, Buck Creek drainage structure and alterations to the C. B. & Q. Railroad in connection with unit R-562 have been completed. Construction of underseepage facilities for unit R-562 are 2 percent complete and will be 75 percent complete on June 30, 1950. Construction of unit L-561, section 1 (Nishnabotna River) levees, has been completed. Construction of unit L-561, sections 2 and 3 and unit L-550, section 1 (Nishnabotna River and High Creek) levees, is 90 percent complete and will be completed by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit L-550, sections 10 to 12 (Rock Creek) levees, is 30 percent complete and will be about 60 percent complete June 30, 1950. A continuing contract has been awarded for unit L-550, section 20 (Rock Creek) levees and construction will be about

25 percent complete June 30, 1950. A contract for raising and altering the C. B. & Q. Railroad High Creek Bridge (L-561) has been negotiated and work will be completed by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit R-573 levees is 90 percent complete and will be completed by June 30, 1950. A contract has been initiated for alterations to the C. B. & Q. Railroad tracks near Minersville, Nebr. (unit R-573), and work will be 80 percent complete by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit L-627-624 levees is 80 percent complete and will be completed by June 30, 1950. A contract has been initiated for raising and altering the Wabash Railroad Mosquito Creek Bridge (unit L-627-624) and work will be completed by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit R-548, sections 1 to 4 (Missouri River) levees is 10 percent complete and will be 40 percent complete June 30, 1950. A contract for alterations to the C. B. & Q. Railroad tracks in connection with unit R-548 has been initiated and work will be completed by June 30, 1950. Continuing contracts will be awarded for construction of levees for unit L-614, section 1, unit L-536, section 1, unit L-614, section 2, unit L-550, sections 2 to 9, and unit L-550, sections 13 to 19, and work under each of these contracts will be about 30 percent complete June 30, 1950. Continuing contracts will be initiated for raising and altering the C. B. & Q. Railroad Mosquito Creek Bridge (unit L-627-624) and the C. B. & Q. Railroad Rock Creek Bridge (unit L-550) and work under these contracts will be 40 and 45 percent complete, respectively, by June 30, 1950. The construction of levees in units R-513-512 (secs. I and II), L-488, L-476, L-488-443, and R-440 is under way by continuing contracts. Levees for units L-448 and L-448-443 will be completed during fiscal year 1950 and levees in units R-513-512 (secs. I and II), L-476, and R-440 will be about 84 percent complete by June 30, 1950. The construction of levees in units R-513-512 (sec. III), R-500, L-497, R-482, and L-400 will be initiated by continuing contracts and from 33 to 67 percent of the work completed by the end of fiscal year 1950. The raising of one railroad and three county highway bridges in unit 5-513-512, a State highway bridge in unit L-497, and a railroad and a State highway bridge in unit L-400 will be initiated and partially completed by the end of fiscal year 1950. The project as a whole was 7 percent complete on June 30, 1949, and will be about 18 percent complete by June 30, 1950.

"Proposed operations, fiscal year 1951: Funds are needed in fiscal year 1951 for continuation of construction of the project. The allocation of \$7,000,000 will be utilized as follows: \$110,000 to complete continuing contract for alterations to C. B. & Q. Mosquito Creek Bridge (unit L-627-624); \$340,000 to complete construction of unit L-550, sections 2 to 9 levees; \$410,000 to complete construction of unit L-550, sections 13 to 19 levees; \$180,000 to complete unit L-550, section 20 levees; \$360,000 to complete unit L-614, section 1 levees; \$200,000 to complete unit L-614, section 2 levees; \$180,000 to complete unit L-536, section 1 levees; \$160,000 to initiate construction of unit L-614, section 3 levees; \$150,000 to initiate construction of unit L-536, section 2 levees; \$150,000 to initiate construction of unit R-548, Little Nemaha section levees; \$170,000 to initiate construction of underseepage facilities for unit L-627-624; \$190,000 to initiate construction of underseepage facilities for unit L-561-550; \$150,000 to initiate construction of underseepage facilities for unit R-573; \$100,000 to initiate construction of unit R-580 levees; and \$150,000 to initiate construction of unit R-652 levees; \$3,450,600 to complete continuing contracts for construction of levees in unit R-513-512, R-500, L-497, R-482, L-476, R-440, and L-400; raising of a railroad bridge and three highway bridges in unit R-513-512; raising a highway bridge in unit L-497, and raising a railroad and a highway bridge in

unit L-400; and \$549,400 to initiate construction by continuing contract of underseepage facilities for units L-488 and L-448-443. With the expenditure of the allocation of \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 1951, the project will be carried to 24 percent completion.

"Work remaining to complete after fiscal year 1951: After the expenditure of \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 1951, funds would be needed to complete construction on units in progress during fiscal year 1951 and to construct the remaining units located on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth.

"Justification: The agricultural levee project is a part of the comprehensive plan for improvement for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin. The plan will provide complete protection to agricultural lands and small communities in the Missouri River Valley against destructive floods. Approximately 1,500,000 acres of land and 50 small communities of 100 or more population between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth of the Missouri River will benefit from the flood-protection works to be constructed under this project. It is estimated that property losses, crop losses, and other damages along the main stem of the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth have amounted to approximately \$140,000,000 in the past several years. The severe flooding in 1947 caused damages of \$65,000,000 in this reach. In view of the constant threat of recurrence of these disastrous floods, it is essential that funds be provided to continue the levee program as scheduled. The allocation of \$7,000,000 is the minimum amount necessary to continue the work as scheduled and provide for the early completion of the more urgently needed protection."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I now make the point of order against the amendment and desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Michigan on the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the report contains recommendations and persuasions on the Army engineers as to the individual projects. The committee recommendation is not mandatory. This amendment would make such allocations mandatory. It is clearly legislation and imposes additional duties on the agency in question. The language in the bill is that which is mandatory upon the engineers, not the language in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Nebraska has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order against the amendment and has presented the grounds for his point of order.

The Chair has examined the amendment and is of the opinion that the amendment seeks to apply a uniform rule for the reduction of funds provided in the bill with respect to all flood-control projects covered and is of the further opinion that the amendment is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that in arriving at the size of appropriation the committee took into consideration the unobligated balances that were available for the project and the speed with which the engineers had indicated that they might act? Is not that the fact?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right. This amendment seeks to make engineers out of Congress. The Congress last year left discretion over percentage cuts in the hands of the engineers. There is a vast difference between that and what this amendment proposes. If we wish to make engineers out of the Members of Congress and to set these cuts in this body, that is one thing. If we want to leave this discretionary power for the engineers, that is quite another thing. I prefer to leave it with the engineers.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support and to speak in favor of that portion of the appropriation bill (H. R. 7786) which includes an item of \$5,000,000 for the central and southern Florida flood-control project.

I believe if there is one meritorious appropriation contained in this bill it is this appropriation for this project. I say this for many and various reasons among which are the following:

First, this appropriation will be the means of the completion of the levees and dikes in the Everglades area which will prevent not only the damage and destruction to property but will be the means of saving human lives. I know of no comparable area in the country which has been afflicted with three successive years of floods—aggravated by storms of hurricane force. Such floods struck my area in 1947, 1948, and most recently in August of 1949. I may state that the storm in August 1949 would have perhaps been the most destructive of life and property but for the fact that the Federal levees around Lake Okeechobee withstood their most severe test and prevented overflow of the lake into the populous upper Everglades area. The work on this project will ultimately give us a high degree of flood protection and water control and will largely eliminate the burden of successive flood losses which threaten the orderly development of southern Florida.

Second. Because I believe that this project which is a joint venture by the Federal Government and the State and people of Florida, is an outstanding example of how the State and Federal authorities can operate in the control

and conservation of water and land resources. This project is significant to the entire Nation and not alone to my State.

Third. This Federal project is one of primary importance to the entire State of Florida and its progressive accomplishment is essential to an orderly development of about one-third of the State which is dependent upon water control for its very existence. I cannot stress upon you too greatly the importance that construction of this project proceed as rapidly as possible. Every year of delay means another year of flood losses, and disruption of our economy. Furthermore the nature of the project and the close interrelation of its various elements, are such that they should be accomplished progressively and rapidly. Otherwise the protector afforded by one element of construction may tend to aggravate flood damages in another unprotected section. This hazard during construction is present in most flood-control projects, but the vast area covered by the project for southern Florida, the uniformly level terrain, and the exposure of this area to hurricane-driven floods, make it particularly applicable to this case.

Fourth. I urge this appropriation for continuing this project because of my personal familiarity with the need for this work. The Sixth Congressional District, which I represent, includes six counties which are wholly or in part within this project area, and a large part of the improvement will be located within my district. I know from first-hand experience, and from the experience of thousands of my constituents, of the tremendous difficulties which they have experienced in developing southern Florida in the face of recurring periods of floods and drought; and I am convinced that this project is essential to their welfare and progress.

Briefly, the accomplishments of the improvement will be as follows:

First, it will afford flood protection to the highly developed urban and farming areas along the east coast and south of Lake Okeechobee. The first phase of the plan of improvement which has been authorized, will give the most urgently needed part of this protection. Subsequent phases, if authorized by Congress, will protect additional areas.

Second, the entire plan of improvement, when ultimately constructed, will benefit over 2,000,000 acres of agricultural land by removing the flood hazard and by affording improved water control in wet and dry periods. This will include over 700,000 acres of fertile new lands which will be made suitable for agricultural development. Without this water control, thousands of acres of this muckland will be lost forever by burning.

Third, the plan of improvement, by conserving floodwaters in parts of the Everglades which are not suitable for agricultural use, will improve water supplies along the east coast of Florida, and in the Caloosahatchee Valley on the west, where the encroachment of salt water is threatening the very existence of the cities and towns and adjacent farming operations.

Fourth, the conservation areas in their natural state will afford unexcelled refuges and breeding grounds for fish and wildlife of many kinds, and provide a large incidental benefit of both commercial and recreational value. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Agriculture has approved the plan from this conservation standpoint.

May I say to the members of the Committee that the sum of \$7,500,000 was included and recommended in the President's budget estimate for this project; however, the Subcommittee on Civil Functions Appropriation reduced the recommendation of the President to \$5,000,000 and it is this sum that I am requesting and pleading be approved in this bill. The quickest way we can get something done to make our people secure against the scourge of floods is too slow. Another flood this coming year will undoubtedly cause damages many times the amount of this appropriation. While I would like to see a much larger appropriation because I know from experience how urgently protection is needed, however, I realize that you must consider other desirable and needed projects and that there are definite limits on appropriations.

I earnestly urge, however, that this sum of \$5,000,000 for continuation of this urgently needed work, which is truly a joint venture of the Federal Government and the people of Florida, be approved by this Committee and then by the House of Representatives.

In conclusion, I most urgently request and most sincerely appeal that you approve the sum of \$5,000,000 which has been recommended by the subcommittee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 339, line 9, strike out "\$341,055,000" and insert "\$343,000,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the amount appropriated by this bill for flood control from \$341,055,000 to \$343,000,000. It raises the amount authorized by this appropriation bill almost the sum of \$2,000,000 in order to take care of the budget amount originally put in for the Conemaugh Dam in the Ohio River Valley, which is a flood-control dam. The amount of increase is just less than \$2,000,000. I have made the amendment in an odd amount because there had previously been an amendment put in of exactly \$2,000,000 for another purpose, the general flood-control study.

The Bureau of the Budget estimate for this year had approved the sum of \$9,000,000 flood-control funds for the continuing of the 1951 construction of the Conemaugh Dam, which is 65 miles up the river from Pittsburgh. The cutting of this amount from \$9,000,000 to \$7,000,000 will reduce the amount by approximately 20 to 25 percent and, of course, will increase the time that it will take to complete this dam.

This dam is not a new structure. It has been under construction from 1946 through 1950; \$26,715,000 has been appropriated through various bills up to

1950, leaving the balance of the cost of constructing this dam, \$17,484,700.

The question is, first, whether it will be more costly or less costly to reduce this appropriation amount at this time. Because the dam is now in course of construction, it will be most costly, because the present structures which are built, the engineering facilities and the equipment which are now there, cannot be used for the purpose for which they are assembled, and will be moved out into accessible areas for other work if feasible.

Consequently, I have today asked the Army engineers of the Department of Defense whether the reduction in funds will cause a delay in the actual construction of the dam. Their office has assured me today that the delay in initiation of clearing up operations and relocations would delay the completion of the project by 1 year, with possible damages to low lines, highways, and utilities not yet acquired necessary to the impoundment of floodwaters. The following was the statement of Mr. Harry Cohen, of the Army engineers, to my office this afternoon:

The reduction in funds will defer the clearing of the reservoir area, the relocations of Indiana branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and certain partial payments for crop damage, and reduce the allocation of funds to land acquisition and relocation of highways and utilities in the reservoir area. Reduction of funds allocated to land acquisition and relocation of highways and utilities will not permit sufficient progress on these items to keep pace with the construction program on the dam.

Delay in initiation of clearing operations and relocations would delay completion of the project by 1 year with possible damages to low lying highways and utilities not yet acquired as a result of the impoundment of floodwaters by the partially completed dam.

You may ask me, "FULTON, are you talking just for Pittsburgh?" No; I am not; I am talking for the defense of the country, because you will remember in 1936 we, in the Pittsburgh area, had a flood that covered the complete downtown area and the whole industrial area along the Ohio, the Monongahela, and the Allegheny Rivers, with inundation clear down the river to Cincinnati. The water in Pittsburgh was up as high as the tops of the street cars, and it took us 6 months in that industrial area to recover. We, in America, constantly hear of the threat of Russia. If we run the risk on one more year's flood in the Ohio, the Monongahela and the Allegheny River Basin, as well as in the Mississippi Valley, you will find that we might be at a terrible disadvantage should world war III break out. I feel that if the Army engineers say that the risk of one more flood in this great industrial area will be incurred by cutting simply \$2,000,000 from this bill, that we had better, for the defense of the country, not do it. For example, the amount of water held back by this one dam is, in floodtime, one-half the amount going over Niagara Falls, so, it is a tremendous dam that is going to hold back the floods that have already once wiped out one of our main towns in Pennsylvania, Johnstown, and, I believe, killed 3,000 people when the previous dam broke.

Under those circumstances, for the defense of the country, it is no small matter. It is not just a local matter that involves one industrial area. I do not believe that anyone on the floor or in the committee can refute the statement of the Army engineers that this will cause a 1-year delay in the construction of this large project, simply by trying to save \$2,000,000 in appropriations during the current year that will have to be put out anyway within the next year or two. We must expeditiously complete the remaining work to be done on the dam, anyhow.

The total cost of the dam is \$44,200,000. The lack of this small amount will cause a great danger to the defense of the country, as well as endanger the productivity of the heart of this industrial center of the Nation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment my colleague from Pennsylvania has offered is really worthy of considerable attention. I know it has been the mood and the temper of the Committee to turn down all these amendments, but sometimes we come to one that is extraordinarily important. The Conemaugh Dam is not located in the districts of either of us. It is located to the north of the city of Pittsburgh. If you will recall, in 1936, when the great flood paralyzed the industrial heart of the United States, there was inaugurated there a program of withholding and impounding the floodwaters of the Monongahela, the Allegheny, and the Ohio Rivers. That program is now well on its way to completion. I know that many of you have read that because that program is on its way to completion Pittsburgh has become one of the boom cities of the Nation. Currently, that great city is building dozens of skyscrapers. New industries are moving in along the waterways. New transportation facilities are being stretched across the State to it.

If this appropriation is cut by \$2,000,000 it will create a gamble of 1 year on the weather. This big dam will cut the possible maximum flood level by some 5½ feet in the city of Pittsburgh. As my colleague pointed out, it will give that great steel-producing center and munitions-producing center a degree of safety which is, I believe, much more vital than many of the things we are currently doing for defense.

We know that the ultimate cost of the project will be increased if the dam is not finished with economic speed. So I say to the Committee that I do wish you would give this amendment very serious consideration.

The amount of funds involved is small and the need is great. If we can get this dam finished on time, the Nation will be safer. The prosperity of one of its great-

est income-producing areas will be safer. I can assure you that in the long run it will pay dividends to the United States of America to have this dam finished on time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I think it should be pointed out in relation to this investment of \$2,000,000 that the Pittsburgh area pays its share by paying over a billion dollars every year in Federal income taxes.

Mr. CORBETT. I not only thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I wish to point out also the completion of this dam is going to mean the completion of the flood protection of the Pittsburgh area. There are presently no other projects in their flood-control scheme being pushed by either the city or the area. So I do hope you will consider this amendment and support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment on the Conemaugh River Reservoir, as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, seeks to increase the amount by \$1,945,000. The budget allowed \$9,000,000 and the committee cut it to \$7,000,000. The reason for the cut and the reason for the action of the committee, I think, will even satisfy the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We found they had an unexpended or unobligated balance of \$4,337,200. That was in November. In December they had practically \$2,600,000. So this sum, added to the \$7,000,000 takes us up to a figure above the \$9,000,000 which was approved by the budget. I think there is very little room here for complaint as to the action of the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. The statement that the gentleman made there might stand some correction. The funds which he says are not obligated, I take it to mean that such funds have not been earmarked and set aside and actually put under contract; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. That is what we understand.

Mr. CORBETT. Here is the difficulty with reference to that. In the impounding of the floodwaters there has to be certain reallocations of railroads, utility lines, public highways, and the like. It is right there that the delay is. It is true that the money has not yet been contracted, but they cannot go ahead and impound the water until they have made these reallocations.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield further to the gentleman, since the time has been limited by the action of the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. But they have in excess of \$9,000,000. They have \$7,000,000 from the committee, \$2,000,000 as a carry-over, and the sum I referred to as two-million-six-hundred-thousand-odd dollars actually is \$2,589,800, which makes a

total of nine million and practically six hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was defeated.

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NOLAND: On page 339, line 1, strike out "\$341,055,000" and insert "\$341,555,000, of which \$500,000 shall be exclusively available for the flood wall at Vincennes, Ind."

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the only reason that I presume upon the time of the House at this late hour in the afternoon is because in January of this year the lives of 25,000 people in the town of Vincennes were severely jeopardized from a tremendous flood in the Wabash River. I might say at this time that I plead guilty to being a member of the economy cut faction. I will always be against economy when stacked up against human life. The \$257,000,000,000 debt mentioned was incurred because it was thought in time of war it was proper to spend money instead of wasting lives. That is where we are on some of these emergency flood-control projects. To my mind, this is one of the most important projects in the Midwest, and it is entitled to highest priority. The seriousness of the recent crisis at Vincennes, Ind., has been attested to by the Corps of Engineers, and their representatives have stated that this is one of the most necessary flood-control items in the entire Midwest. Past Congresses have already appropriated \$90,000,000 for plans and specifications, so this project is ready to go, as soon as sufficient construction funds are allocated.

In January of this year the city of Vincennes experienced a flood crisis. This makes the second time that this entire city has been in extreme danger of being flooded. Previously, in 1943, the city was in great danger and had it not been for 3,500 soldiers sent from Camp Atterbury to fight the flood, the city would probably have been inundated at that time.

In January of this year a second crisis of similar proportions was experienced. One thousand soldiers from Fort Knox spent approximately 3 weeks in Knox County under the direction of the Louisville district engineer fighting a flood crest which topped the existing flood wall.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAND. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I have a telegram from Governor Schricker, of Indiana, who is not in favor of pork-barrel legislation and who has the reputation of being very economical. Here is what he says:

Understand you are to appear before the Budget Director on Monday with respect to an added appropriation for the Vincennes flood-wall project. This is the most important item from the standpoint of Federal assistance in Indiana today. The next flood

could easily represent the loss of millions of dollars. It was saved only this time by the heroic efforts of the military forces and the men, women, and children of the community. This is a most critical situation and deserves precedence over many other projects. I want to support your efforts with my strongest possible recommendation.

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,

Governor.

I may say I live directly south of Vincennes and the people of my district are especially interested in this project, because, if Vincennes is inundated, all communications to the north and east are cut off. It would cut off all traffic on the main roads south from Chicago.

I am supporting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. NOLAND. I think that is very important, and I would like to say that I went to Vincennes to see the concrete flood wall there. It is an actual fact that it is about a 12-inch concrete wall, and there are cracks in that wall as big as your hand. The engineers went in there and sandbagged the cracks. They built a secondary sandbag levee 45 feet behind it. As a matter of fact, the waters of the Wabash actually topped the PWA-built concrete wall, and the only way they stopped it was by putting a frame box extension on top of the concrete wall and filling it with mud. The water actually went several inches above the top of that wall. It is a real crisis there. It looks like we will be able to escape a flood this spring, but those are things that will be repeated. The strange thing about it is that the Bureau of the Budget is willing to recommend millions of dollars to repair these agricultural flood levees. The situation at Vincennes is that the agricultural levees, both on the Indiana and the Illinois side, protect those farm lands, and they funnel the water right down to Vincennes where it forms a bottleneck. The only thing that saved the city was because the levee broke way up above Vincennes on the Indiana side, and directly across the river at Lawrenceville, Ill. Go back in there with engineers, rebuild those levee walls, form the funnel, and Vincennes will be endangered again in another flood crisis. For that reason I believe that the men, women, and children, who got out and filled sandbags in this last flood crisis are entitled to some Federal help to protect their cities.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment end in 8 minutes, the last three to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I live north of Vincennes, but I was born and raised south of Vincennes. I have seen the floods down the Wabash and the Ohio Rivers, and I have seen homes washed away. I remember in 1937 I had to have a police escort to get to my father's home, with no communications intact, before I could find out whether or not their home had been washed down the river.

I believe in economy, but I am not opposed to investing money to save lives.

I assume that although we are called upon to spend \$13,500,000,000 for defense in this country that life is going to go on, and it is a part of the progress of this country to protect those people.

I suppose this amendment is not going to have much chance of passing—like all the rest of the amendments that have been offered here this afternoon. It reminds me of what the judge said along about the middle of the morning; after holding court for a couple of hours he threatened to clear the courtroom unless he had order, that he had had to send six men to the penitentiary and had not heard a word of the evidence.

But I want to say this to you, Mr. Chairman; this is the one point I want to make: \$300,000 was spent at Vincennes, Ind., in January of this year to build up a sandbag wall to keep Vincennes from being washed down river. We are asking for \$500,000 to increase the height of the wall, to make it permanent. Before another 12 months roll around you may have to spend another \$300,000 to build up a sandbag wall to save the city.

Is that not a question of being penny-wise and pound-foolish? I respect the Bureau of the Budget, but that is not a sufficient answer to me.

In conclusion, let me say that neither is it a sufficient answer to the people who live in Knox County, Ind., especially when last year this Congress was called upon to vote and did vote over my protest, if you remember, six times this amount to subsidize what they call Freedom Fair here in Washington. Now, most of those Knox County people down there who live under that flood wall are not going to come to Washington to enjoy that celebration, but they are going to help pay for it whether they are washed down the Wabash River or not. This is \$500,000 to start making permanently safe Vincennes. Remember, you spent \$300,000 in January of this year to save the city. I hope that this will be the one amendment where this House shows that the representatives of the people are making the determination, and not the Bureau of the Budget. This is a meritorious amendment. I appeal to my colleagues to support it on behalf of those people down on the Wabash River.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The injection of the words "Freedom Fair" into this discussion is very much like talking about Europe. We are today talking about Uncle Sam's pocket-book and our necessities, just how much screening is necessary so that we may continue to go along and take care of the huge problems that we in the Eighty-first Congress find upon our doorstep.

I want to particularly compliment the three gentlemen from Indiana, all of whom appeared in justification of this project before the committee, Mr. NOLAND, Mr. DENTON, and Mr. JACOBS. Their constituents may well be proud of them. But we cannot differentiate in these projects.

This project is in the same category as any other unbudgeted project this year. There is no need for us to dwell upon

the argument of an unbudgeted project. We have had that up several times today; so with the same argument I presented before I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NOLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NOLAND) there were—ayes 11, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to allot 2 minutes of the committee's time to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 339, after line 14, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Lewiston-Clarkston, Idaho and Washington; for the initiation of construction on the Lewiston-Clarkston project, authorized in the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), \$1,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it calls for a reclamation project and is not germane.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I withhold it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, recently this Congress was called upon to appropriate \$25,000,000 not for flood control, but to repair flood damages on the Columbia River in the Northwest. This committee has slaughtered the Army engineers flood-control program on the Columbia River in bringing in this bill. We are getting practically no consideration at all in the Northwest.

The Army engineers, in recognition of the danger of floods at Lewiston requested an appropriation in the budget submitted this year of \$1,000,000 for planning and initial construction on this project. The Bureau of the Budget, failing to understand the urgent need for flood protection at Lewiston, cut the item to \$25,000 for planning only, and the House committee has struck out all planning projects.

So that you may know how urgent and important this project is, I am going to read a letter to the Committee, addressed to me, from General Pick, of the Army engineers, and also a letter to Senator DWORSHAK, who kindly gave me a copy, and I ask your support in restoring the item to the appropriation bill:

XCVI—421

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, October 28, 1949.
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: Reference is made to your letter of October 20, 1949, enclosing a communication from Mr. William P. Hughes, city engineer of Lewiston, Idaho, concerning the availability of funds for the strengthening of the North Lewiston dike.

As you may recall, the River and Harbor Act of 1945 authorized a project for navigation and other purposes on the Snake River, which included, among other items, the reconstruction and strengthening of the levees and flood walls on both banks of the Clearwater River and on the right bank of the Snake River at Lewiston. To date, however, no funds have been appropriated by Congress for this work, and we are unable to initiate the authorized construction until the necessary funds are appropriated for that purpose.

The Corps of Engineers fully recognizes the importance of the authorized levee rehabilitation work at Lewiston and the benefits that will be realized upon completion of that construction. Accordingly, you may be assured that we are prepared to initiate the work promptly when the necessary funds are appropriated by Congress for that purpose. In this connection, I may mention also that when hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1951 are held by the Appropriations Committee of Congress we will be prepared to answer any questions the committee members may ask concerning the funds required for the construction of these flood-protection works at Lewiston.

I trust that this information will be sufficient for your present purposes. In the event, however, I can be of any further assistance to you in this connection, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

During the limited time at my disposal, Mr. Chairman, I am unable to present all of the facts, but I want to say to you that this project has been authorized, and you will find it on page 13 of Public Law 14, approved March 2, 1945; and when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] presses his point of order, I will be prepared to meet it.

I would like to also read a letter from the Chief of Engineers to Senator DWORSHAK under date of November 3, 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, November 3, 1948.
Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: Further reference is made to your letter of August 30, 1948, and its accompanying enclosures from Mr. William P. Hughes, city engineer at Lewiston, concerning the construction of dikes at Lewiston, Idaho. By letter of September 1, 1948, you were advised that Col. Theron D. Weaver, the division engineer of the North Pacific Division, was requested to submit a report thereon, which has now been received, based on information furnished by Col. O. E. Walsh, the district engineer at Portland, Oreg.

As you know, the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, authorized the modification of the Federal project for the Snake River in general accordance with a plan contained in House Document 704, Seventy-fifth Congress. This authorization provides for construction of such dams as are necessary and open channel improvement between the mouth of the

river and Lewiston, Idaho, for purposes of slack-water barges navigation, irrigation, and power development. The plan of improvement now developed consists of four dams with high-lift locks to overcome a differential in elevation of 375 feet between the Columbia River and Lewiston, fish-passing facilities, and hydroelectric installations. The dam sites tentatively selected are located 10, 45, 72, and 113 miles, respectively, above the mouth of the Snake River. To date no river and harbor funds have been appropriated by Congress with which to construct this authorized project.

The levees that local interests are desirous of having constructed at this time are an integral part of the ultimate plan for the development of the lower Snake River and are required in connection with the proposed Lower Granite Dam, the uppermost of the four dams to be constructed between Lewiston and the mouth of the river. This dam, which is scheduled to be the last of the four dams to be constructed, will create a navigable pool extending to the vicinities of Lewiston and Clarkston. As the normal pool of the reservoir will be approximately 10 feet above ordinary low water at the confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers, levees at this locality have been included in the approved plan.

The levee plan consists essentially of three units, of which one would be located on the Snake River adjacent to the city of Clarkston, and two would be located on the Snake and Clearwater Rivers, adjacent to the city of Lewiston. These levees, which normally would be constructed concurrently with the dam, are primarily intended to prevent such additional damage as the existence of the lower Granite pool might cause during major floods. These levees would also provide continuous protection against all natural stream flow conditions up to the designed flood stage. It is this latter protection that is now desired by local interests, in the interim before the construction of the lower Granite Dam. On the basis of the present price levels the probable cost of the proposed levees is estimated to be \$1,200,000.

As indicated above, the initiation of construction of this authorized Federal project is dependent upon the appropriation of the necessary construction funds therefor by Congress, and the early construction of the levees in the vicinity of Lewiston would require a specific appropriation of funds by Congress for that purpose. You may be assured that prompt measures will be taken toward accomplishing the desired levee protection as soon as the required funds are made available.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General,
Chief of Engineers,

Copy to North Pacific division, Portland district.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take the time of the House at this late hour. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 339, before the period in line 14, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, further. That there is hereby appropriated an

additional sum of \$750,000 for flood control work at Bonners Ferry, Idaho."

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, both the committee and the Bureau of the Budget have made a very serious mistake in striking this item from the appropriation bill.

We have in north Idaho a beautiful, productive valley known as the Kootenai Valley in Boundary County. It surrounds the county seat of Bonners Ferry. Many years ago the people on their own initiative organized drainage districts, bonded themselves, and raised the money for flood protection, and built what you call levees in the South but are called dikes in our country, and diked out 13 drainage districts in this beautiful productive valley of the Kootenai, where they raise as much as 80 bushels of wheat to the acre.

In 1934 extra high water broke through most of these dikes and the Government incurred a very heavy expense in rehabilitating the dikes and refinancing the people on the land. Only 2 years ago the floods came in and broke the dikes and flooded the drainage districts and the town of Bonners Ferry again. The Army engineers who came to the rescue of the town and the districts spent a large amount of this emergency appropriation of \$25,000,000 to rehabilitate the dikes, strengthen them, and protect the town of Bonners Ferry.

Now the Bureau of the Budget comes out with the proposition that as long as they are going to build a flood-control dam at Libby upstream the repair of these dikes will be only an interim project, and will not be needed after the Libby Dam is built, and so appropriation for flood protection of Bonners Ferry and drainage districts was stricken from the bill. But who knows when the Libby Dam is going to be built? It may be 15 or 20 years, and in the meantime the town of Bonners Ferry and the beautiful farmland of the Kootenai Valley will be left at the mercy of the floods of the Kootenai River and the Kootenai Valley may be destroyed.

It is my contention that both the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee made a very serious mistake in taking this item out of the program of the Army engineers to complete a work that is so well begun and means so much to north Idaho and the welfare of the country, particularly of the transcontinental railroads that serve that district. That valley is crossed by the main line of the Great Northern Railroad and also a branch of the Canadian Pacific, the Spokane & International.

It is my contention that this amendment should be adopted and this item should be restored to the bill. The town of Bonners Ferry should be protected just as was intended by the Army engineers in putting this item in the program. I ask the gentleman from Michigan to accept the amendment, and I hope that if he ever gets his assignment changed he will take over the ECA and give the people of America a little protection when it comes to economy.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the compliment. This

is an unbudgeted item. The same reasons that have been advanced before against unbudgeted items apply here. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, in providing for flood control we are strengthening the economy of our country, and it cannot be considered an out-of-pocket cost that offers no return. It was primarily this recognition that caused the Federal Government to assume responsibility of flood control.

By providing economic projects in flood-control programs we preserve the soil of our Nation. Until a comparatively few years ago the soil of this Nation was being depleted to an unreasonable and incredible extent. Therefore, flood control and soil conservation, together with power development, go hand in hand in preserving and strengthening the economy of America.

It is recognized that flood-control projects usually require years from the time of first recognition from an engineering standpoint is given until its completion as an actual reality. It is well recognized that it will require years and years of consideration and action to complete even a minimum flood-control program. It, therefore, becomes necessary to approach these projects as it is finally decided to have the least possible impact on our budget from year to year as we build to strengthen our future economy. In parceling out the funds for projects, I think attention should be given to those that would give the greatest immediate return and the most justifiable relief and protection.

There are several projects in our State under construction; some of which are highly important to my own district.

I wish to call attention to a few of these that have particular significance and importance in my part of the State. This in no way minimizes the importance of others that affect our State or other sections and States of our great country.

BLAKELY MOUNTAIN

Blakely Mountain project was authorized a few years ago as a multiple purpose project, power dam, and flood control reservoir. The total estimated ultimate cost to complete the project will be approximately \$31,000,000. Already we have provided almost \$7,000,000 toward this project and it is now well under construction.

This appropriation carries an additional \$2,500,000. This will provide sufficient funds to carry on this year's construction that this project may get pretty well along toward ultimate completion.

This project is important to our area because it is a main reservoir to control the upper waters of the Ouachita River which traverse the heart of my district. It, together with other projects when ultimately completed will furnish the flood-control protection that will inure to the benefit of that whole area, and

thus as a small segment to the economy of our country.

NARROWS RESERVOIR

The Narrows project likewise just above my district also provides protection to the Ouachita watershed. It is on the upper Little Missouri River, which is a tributary of the Ouachita and will contain the water out of the mountains in the upper part of that stream, adding to protection of our people below where floods frequently occur.

The Narrows project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1941.

I am proud of the fact to have also had some part in the authorization and providing funds for this project. It is, however, a small project with an ultimate total cost of \$13,500,000. Already more than half of the funds have been made available to complete this project.

In this bill an additional \$1,500,000 is provided which will mean that with this year, the project will be 75 or 80 percent complete. This, too, is a multiple purpose project providing benefits for both hydroelectric power and flood control.

OZAN CREEK, CHANNEL CLEARANCE

In connection with the Narrows Reservoir project, there was authorized some \$58,000 for the channel clearance of Ozan Creek in Hempstead County.

Out of the funds made available here, Mr. Chairman, I am going to insist that \$53,700 be used and the engineers enter into a contract for this work to proceed.

This is a small project but there is no project in the bill that is more justifiable and to which there is a greater responsibility of the Government. The engineers included this as a part of their request to the budget. The budget reduced the amount for the entire project. There is some question that this might be a new project but notwithstanding this viewpoint by some, it cannot be considered anything except a part of the Narrows project because it is in the same area.

There are only approximately 12 miles of channel clearance but this 12 miles is important in that it provides an outlet of three forks of Ozan Creek, and in as fine alluvial soil as there is in the Nation.

Four thousand three hundred dollars has already been allotted and the planning completed, and only \$53,700 is needed to do this work.

The reason I insist on this, Mr. Chairman, is because it was in this area the Federal Government took over some 60,000 acres which it used during the war as a testing area for ammunition. The heart of this county then went for war purposes, affecting seriously the economy of the county.

After the war the Government abandoned the area and after a long continuous fight, we got it returned to production, giving the people the opportunity of reclaiming this land in order that it may again be returned to agriculture.

Private interests before it was taken over had constructed their own private canals for drainage. By road beds and other obstruction, the Government in

utilizing it for war purposes has practically destroyed the drainage and outlet that private interests had previously, at their own expense, provided to drain this area.

These three channels come together, providing an outlet for the water and it is necessary to channel these 12 miles to let this water get out.

I submit to you in all fairness and in justice to those people this should be done and I believe will be done during this fiscal year.

The members of this committee indicated to me a year ago that as this property was just being returned to production they would endeavor to include it this year.

The engineers have made their request recognizing its importance and made a statement to the committee on it. I have obtained the complete breakdown on the Narrows project and there is every justification that this amount of funds can be used for this channel clearance a few miles below. This can be done by using \$53,700 of the \$1,500,000 in this bill for the Narrows Reservoir and Little Missouri River project. I have discussed it with the engineers and I am fully confident that it would not greatly interfere with the progress of the dam and reservoir. It would provide immediate relief to the people in the area of these three forks of Ozan Creek, by only requiring the channeling of this 12 miles.

OUACHITA RIVER

These projects are part of the comprehensive plan of the Ouachita River program giving protection to the watershed which covers many thousands of acres.

A few days ago the Congress authorized the entire program, which when completed will be as fine and complete a flood-control program, including power and navigation as there will be found anywhere in the country.

In this additional authorization to complete the program for which appropriations will be made in the future, \$21,300,000 was authorized. Though the total funds required to complete the project is estimated to be a little more than \$36,000,000, the entire project was approved, but deferring a reservoir and a large measure of the navigation costs.

DEGRAY DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Congress provided this authorization \$18,950,000 for DeGray multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on the Caddo River above Arkadelphia in Clark County. This is below Blakely Mountain by several miles and will provide an important reservoir as part of this comprehensive program.

BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW

For the Bayou Bartholomew project in Ashley County and Louisiana, there was authorized \$1,520,000 which will give drainage to a highly important agricultural area. There were other smaller projects authorized adding to this ultimate program of flood control protection. Though the Murfreesboro Reservoir was approved, the \$2,500,000 required was deferred pending the developing of these other projects first.

NINE-FOOT CHANNEL

There is at present a 6½-foot navigation channel on the Ouachita River up as far as Camden, Ark. Funds in this appropriation are being made available to continue the necessary dredging which was started from funds made available during this fiscal year to make this a 6½ foot channel all the year.

The Congress authorizing a 9-foot channel by lengthening the existing locks to 525 feet and deepening them to accommodate 9-foot draft navigation, providing for channel realignment, cut-offs, and so forth, will add to the economic benefits of the area and provide navigation outlet to the Gulf of Mexico. Though there will be much time required, in fact, it will be years completing this program, we feel substantial progress has been made and this entire project well under way from which not only the people in the area but the Government will start receiving benefits and returns from the investment.

BAYOU MACON-TENSAS RIVER

A few years ago the people of southeast Arkansas were constantly flooded by what was then known as the fuse-plug in the levee on the west bank of the Mississippi. After long and careful consideration, the Congress closed the fuse-plug and provided levee protection on this side of the river as it had previously provided on the east side. It was thought that this would provide needed protection for this area in Chicot, Desha and other counties.

Many drainage districts had been constructed by local interests. It developed that the drainage was not adequate and the Congress authorized in the act of 1946, the Bayou Macon and Tensas drainage program, extending this program up from the confluence of these rivers in Louisiana.

For 3 years, we have been working toward obtaining sufficient appropriations to carry out this authorization to provide this needed relief.

The entire project is a large one, covering an area of 3,000,000 acres. There are some 750 miles of streams to be enlarged and improved, all at an estimated cost of more than \$20,000,000.

Thus far during the last 2 years the Congress has appropriated \$4,235,000; all of this, and necessarily so, must go to the lower end of the project in Louisiana and as the project progresses upstream, it will provide relief for the Arkansas part of the project.

To my consternation and great dismay, there is only \$725,000 in this bill to carry forward this program. I understand this was the amount the engineers recommended within ceiling of the budget. This will bring the work up to the junction of Bayou Lafourche and Tensas River. As I understand, this will complete the lower outlet and then the work will proceed with greater expedition as the funds are made available.

In that the lower end will be opened up, it will be my intention to insist that the Army engineers utilize a greater portion of the funds we appropriate each year for the lower Mississippi area, of which this is a part, in order that this drainage

program may proceed at a much faster rate.

RED RIVER LEVEES—BANK STABILIZATION

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in this appropriation bill, \$500,000 is provided for levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam on Red River in Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana. The Red River levee and bank stabilization program is a highly important one to our area and well under way. Over two and one-half million dollars has been appropriated and utilized for bank stabilization, levee and bayou program. With this, the total project would be a little less than half completed. The committee has been very considerate in providing these funds as indicated could be used in carrying forward this program. The people in Hempstead and Lafayette Counties in my district, in Miller County, and the entire southwestern part of our State are anxiously awaiting the completion of this program, which will give protection to a fine and prosperous agricultural area.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has been very, very interested in this project. He has spoken to me on ever so many occasions and I know he has spoken to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Judge Kerr, about it on several occasions and as a result the judge and I have had several conferences about the project. Both the Army engineers and the budget regard this project as a new project. It is unbudgeted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say personally I talked to the engineers and they do not regard it as a new project. That is what they told me, even though the budget marked it out when it was sent here. The Army engineers made a request for it to the budget and the budget sent to the Congress a reduced amount from what was requested by the Army engineers, and the committee itself has reduced that amount by about \$250,000.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to my distinguished friend, a member of our staff has had a contact with the budget on this particular project and the information brought back to us is that they do regard it as a new project. Now, that is the information which we received, and it resulted really from the great work that the gentleman placed upon me with his continual questioning of me as to how it was going to be handled.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the members of the committee and I do want to apologize for bothering them about this. But I do feel the Government, even though it is a small project, has a responsibility for what it did during the war. The Army engineers advised me they do not consider it a new project. It is part of the whole area.

If this could be worked out without increasing the amount of funds to be used for this purpose it would be very helpful if the gentleman and his colleague on the committee would help me to work it out.

Mr. RABAUT. I can say for myself that I have every confidence in the ability of the Army engineers to select projects. If they see fit to cooperate with the gentleman, certainly there will be no complaint coming from me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the chapter.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CHUDOFF (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

COMPETITION FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIAN FOOTWEAR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the special order that I have for tonight, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the New England Shoe and Leather Association have written me that an investigation being made by the Commissioner of Customs and the fact that the Commissioner has also ordered a substantial increase in the bonds required of importers of Czechoslovakian shoes is already having a beneficial effect for the New England shoe industry.

The letter from Mr. Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association reads as follows:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE AND
LEATHER ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 4, 1950.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: We are happy to advise that the Commissioner of Customs has ordered an investigation, requested by our Association, of current imports of Czechoslovakian-made women's shoes. This investigation will determine whether these shoes are being sold in violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921, as claimed by our association.

The Commissioner has also ordered a substantial increase in the bonds which the importer is required to post on all such future imports. In the opinion of many members of our association, this requirement of additional bonds will go far to deter further imports of these shoes from Czechoslovakia.

Your personal assistance in communicating with both the Treasury and State Departments on this vital matter was most helpful in securing such favorable and prompt action by the Commissioner of Customs. Our association members are deeply appreciative of your cooperation and support.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

MAXWELL FIELD,
Executive Vice President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION ENCOURAGES COMMUNISM

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present at the recent dinners addressed by the President and Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Therefore I did not hear their statements about the charges made by Senator McCARTHY concerning Reds in the State Department. These charges are currently being aired before a Senate investigating committee.

I did read the newspaper accounts of the speeches made by the President and the Secretary of State. They both constituted blanket denials of Communist infiltration in the State Department and other departments of the Government. The denials were unsupported by anything more than demagogic intimations that, if any criminality exists, it must be on the part of Senator McCARTHY.

This, it was said, because he is seeking to destroy the confidence of the American people in our Government and its foreign office at a time of international emergency.

It should be apparent to anyone that Senator McCARTHY, far from seeking to destroy any confidence, is seeking to correct a scandalous situation which has already destroyed the confidence of many Americans; not in our Government but in those who are now in control of the Government, including the Department of State.

Senator McCARTHY is seeking in the only way possible to restore that confidence in any degree. That only way is to clean out of our Government the Reds and fellow travelers for whom the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations alone are responsible.

I know something personally whereof I speak. It may be recalled that it was only at my insistence that you have continued to hear about the notorious Amerasia case.

By this time many of you must know how frantically the administration and the State Department fought to protect six persons arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on charges of stealing hundreds of documents, many of them top secret, involving national security, from the State, War, and Navy Departments. You may recall that the handling of this case shocked even supporters of the administration.

In that case, the remarkable efforts of the FBI were deliberately and wantonly nullified. Through the connivance of leading officials of the Justice and State Departments, in the Amerasia case, traitors within our Government were given protection and absolution.

In his speech, before the Federal Bar Association, the President suggested that Communists are a small minority in the United States, harmless though noisy. He suggested that our only real danger from communism comes from outside. He asserted that no Communists are now working for the Government; or working, rather, for the Kremlin within the American Government. He asserted also that his loyalty-screening program is completely successful.

If these statements by the President are true, then how did it happen that this harmless Communist minority, through one of its cells in our Government, stole hundreds of documents from the State, War, and Navy Departments? They did so; no one can deny it. It has been proved in a Federal court that they did so. How does it happen, too, that members of another Communist cell in our Government stole the secrets of the atom bomb and gave them to the masters of the Kremlin?

If the President's loyalty-screening program is so successful, how is it that George Shaw Wheeler thrice was cleared by Government loyalty boards? All of you must know that only a few weeks ago Wheeler sought refuge in Czechoslovakia, behind the iron curtain, saying that he did so in order to escape the gestapo methods of the American occupation government in eastern Germany. During the years when Wheeler was a trusted, policy-making official of the occupation government, in the employ of our own Defense Department, I stood on this floor to protest, pointing out

Wheeler's record. His conduct since then has amply confirmed and corroborated my charges, for which I was vilified by administration supporters at the time.

The President declared that Senator McCARTHY was an asset of the Kremlin. If the Senator's effort to rid the Government of those who have infiltrated the Federal payroll to wreck the Nation is an asset to Russia, then how much greater asset is the President who has belittled the efforts of a congressional committee doing the same, by calling it a red herring, and issuing an order denying the right of the committee to examine the files of Government employees suspected of disloyalty.

Such statements and action by the President not only shielded and protected those who would destroy our Government but, consciously or unconsciously, actually encouraged them to greater efforts in their treasonable work. How the Kremlin must have laughed when it learned how the President of the United States was playing into its hands.

Secretary of State Acheson told the American Society of Newspaper Editors that the attacks by Senator McCARTHY on the State Department are a filthy business. He had the cheek to tell the editors he stood before them to clear away some of the trash. Of course a cleanup such as Senator McCARTHY seeks is a filthy job. But where is the filth? In the United States Senate, or in the Department of State?

John E. Peurifoy told the Senate investigating committee that the Department has fired in recent months nearly a hundred moral perverts—bad security risks, all of them, because of vulnerability to blackmail—and nearly 200 Communists or Communist sympathizers. Does this sound as if there is no dirty business in the State Department? If there is any trash to be cleared away, perhaps it consists of many who hold confidential jobs in the Department.

Both the President and Dean Acheson made a great point in their speeches of the assertion that the State Department never employs no disloyal persons whatsoever. It is to be supposed, then, that they are so naive as to believe that espionage agents like Alger Hiss ever are found alone. Almost anybody would know better than that. No man can operate an espionage system alone. And now that I am on the subject of Alger Hiss, I would like to ask a question, one that perhaps has been asked here before.

Have the President and Secretary Acheson ever considered the deadly parallel between the Hiss case and those now before the Senate investigating committee? In all of these cases, the statute of limitations has run. Hiss would be a free man today, if he had not perjured himself in an attempt to preserve his career. Possibly Truman, Acheson and company have considered this parallel. Perhaps that is the reason for the present frenzied campaign of denials.

Pending now before the Rules Committee is my resolution which would authorize a bipartisan committee to reopen and thoroughly investigate the Amerasia case. Authorization of this committee,

I believe, would mean that justice at long last would be meted out to those who seek the downfall of our Government. The proof of the President's sincerity would lie in the reopening of the Amerasia case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SPECIAL INTERESTS MAY WRECK HOOVER COMMISSION PROPOSALS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, by and large, endorse the objectives of the Hoover Commission. Not a day goes by but that some Member receives a letter from a constituent urging speedy action on the recommendations proposed by that distinguished group of public-spirited citizens who comprised the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Every individual knows from his own experience and contact with Government agencies that there is room for improvement in the working of Government. Every taxpayer rightly insists that he should get full value for his tax dollar.

Efficiency and economy have become watchwords of the American people. They recognize that to meet the difficult problems of the atomic age, our democratic Government must be sound and strong and efficiently organized.

The Hoover Commission set out with a mandate from Congress to study our complex Government machinery and to make recommendations for overhauling it. Agencies and functions were to be re-grouped by major purpose to reduce their number, to eliminate overlap and duplication wherever possible; in short, to make the structure of Government more compact and coherent and more amenable to effective management by the Chief Executive. Within each department and agency, lines of authority and accountability were to be clearly drawn, centering full authority and responsibility in the Executive head and allowing him to delegate to subordinates. Adequate staff assistance was to be provided and the management activities of Government improved and strengthened.

These broad objectives were laudable, commanding support and approval, not only by the people, but by the Congress and the administration. The Congress established the legal framework for the exercise of Presidential initiative in Government reorganization by passing the Reorganization Act of 1949. Other vital reorganization bills were passed, holding forth the real promise of large savings. Prominent among these enactments were the military unification law and the law establishing the General Services Administration. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I have been privileged to take an active part in the legislative work on reorganization.

The President, for his own part, promptly directed the departments and agencies of the executive branch to search out and put into operation every possible administrative improvement. He appointed an eminent committee of citizens to advise him on administrative

management and to keep watch on reorganization progress in the executive branch. One series of reorganization plans was submitted to the Congress by the President last year and another series is pending before us now.

Experts in public administration say that we have accomplished more in the past year by way of Government reorganization than in any like period in all our history. Mr. Hoover himself, while pointing out that the job of Government reorganization cannot be done overnight, that it is a long-term process, has said recently that the progress made by this Congress and administration to date is "truly astonishing." President Truman estimated in his message accompanying the 21 reorganization plans of 1950 that approval of these plans will bring us to the half-way mark in carrying out the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a most strange and peculiar event. The President's reorganization plans, submitted in good faith and with serious regard for the objectives sought by the Hoover Commission, are being assailed from every quarter of the business community. One group opposes one plan; another group opposes another plan. The loud lip service for the Hoover Commission report in general has changed into loud lip noises against the Hoover Commission reports in particular. Many of those organizations who so dutifully went on record in support of the Hoover Commission report are now finding reasons—at least their Washington lobbyists and spokesmen are finding reasons—why one or another of the President's reorganization plans should be opposed and rejected.

The American Bankers' Association has undertaken a grass-roots campaign to work up opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1. The organized bankers do not like this plan because they do not have faith in the administrative supervision that some future Secretary of the Treasury might exercise over the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. I say "future Secretary" because, in this instance, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder shares the views of the banking community. He has joined then in expressing opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1, ignoring the judgment of his own Chief Executive and the Director of the Budget.

The patent lawyers of this country do not trust the Secretary of Commerce. They see in Reorganization Plan No. 5 a device whereby the Secretary of Commerce will award patents to his political friends and tear down the American free-enterprise system.

The ship-owning interests would perhaps like to join in the hue and cry by opposing Reorganization Plan No. 21, transferring the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce. They have been less vocal, I dare say, because the quality of administration of ship subsidies in the presently constituted Maritime Commission is something less than is to be desired.

Ex-Senator Joe Ball has articulated the views of those who do not trust the Attorney General of the United States.

His business letter, I am told, expresses opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 2 because he sees in it a device whereby the Federal Bureau of Investigation will come too much under the thumb of the Attorney General.

The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers are opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 12 relating to the National Labor Relations Board, because they like the administrative absurdity created by the Taft-Hartley Act better than they like good government.

These and other assorted business and financial organizations are also opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 6 because they do not accept the Hoover Commission recommendations that the Department of Labor should be resurrected and the Secretary of Labor given full authority to administer certain laws relating to labor. A Secretary of Labor, in their eyes, has less integrity and less conscientiousness as a public servant than the secretary of some other department.

I do not know where the big farm organizations stand on Reorganization Plan No. 4, but it is safe to say that they do not greet with joyous acclaim the centering of full authority and responsibility over the Government's agricultural activities in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Nor will the mining interests greet with joyous acclaim Reorganization Plan No. 3, which would make the Bureau of Mines, among other Interior units, wholly responsible to the Secretary of the Interior. Perhaps the same can be said for some of the reclamation interests which have been backstopping the Bureau of Reclamation in its hardly concealed opposition to the proposed CVA which the Secretary of Interior has fully endorsed.

I have been reliably informed, Mr. Speaker, that opposition has been expressed by one group or another to 15 of the 21 reorganization plans submitted by the President and pending before the Congress. My latest count shows there are now 17 separate resolutions of disapproval which have been formerly introduced in either the House or Senate on 14 of the 21 reorganization plans.

I venture to say that more such resolutions of disapproval will be forthcoming as the various interests in opposition become more vocal. It is the right and privilege of every Member to introduce such resolutions. I do not question the good faith of any Member who may take objection. Each case may have some merit from the standpoint of the group affected. The question I wish to raise is: Where will this process end, Mr. Speaker? If every particular group or private interest is to be satisfied by a resolution and by a vote of disapproval, the work of the Hoover Commission will go down the drain. The \$2,000,000 spent by that Commission will have gone for naught. The grandiloquent sentiments of support for the Hoover Commission, which so many business organizations were quick to make, will turn out to be the hollow voices of hypocrisy.

A citizens' committee has been established for some time to educate the public on the findings of the Hoover Com-

mission and to mobilize support for the Commission's recommendations. Many solid and respectable businessmen are to be found among the sponsors of the citizens' committee. They have contributed money to the organization. They have spread the gospel of the Hoover Commission far and wide. But now in many cases, they find their own business interests opposed to reorganization. Perhaps that explains the fact that the citizens' committee has been less than a bold advocate of the President's reorganization plans.

As these plans come before our Committee on Expenditures, and hearings are held on the resolutions of disapproval, we try to hear all views, despite the limited time allowed under the Reorganization Act. Oftentimes, the points advanced by opponents of a plan are sincerely made and worthy of serious consideration. Nevertheless, I must say that it is amusing and almost pathetic to note some of the arguments which are being used to justify opposition to these basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The twinge of conscience is readily apparent, Mr. Speaker. Of course, they support the Hoover Commission—but.

Some accuse the President of bad faith, as did a spokesman for the United States Chamber of Commerce, when he told our Committee on Expenditures that Reorganization Plan No. 12 was a device to "get Denham," general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Some profess to be doubtful of the legality of a proposed reorganization, and as creators of the doubt, urge against the acceptance of a measure of doubtful legality.

Eagerly they search the four corners of the Hoover Commission reports, the reports of the task forces, the staff memoranda, to find some phrase, some shade of meaning, some equivocation that will give a breath of support to their views.

Some deny that economy or efficiency will result from the proposed reorganization, and cover their retreat by stoutly maintaining that even economy or efficiency are too high in price to pay for the immeasurable harm that allegedly will be done by the particular reorganization.

Where the Hoover Commission made a recommendation covering all analogous departments or agencies, arguments now are put forth to the effect that this or that agency should be exempt, either because it is so different from the rest or because the Hoover Commission did not single it out for special mention when the general recommendation was made.

Behind these and similar arguments lies a simple and understandable desire by many of the special groups concerned to let well enough alone, to oppose any change in organization lest an entrenched interest or a favored position be disturbed in relationships carefully built up with the agencies of Government.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, I detect frequently behind these arguments of opposition, a lack of faith in the basic principles of Government organization which the Hoover Commission so clearly and repeatedly advocated. The Com-

mission went ahead of the assumption that democratic government must be based on trust, not on mistrust. The Commission believed that the placement of full authority in the executive heads of regrouped departments and agencies was good, not bad, because accountability goes with authority. We cannot hold a public administrative official fully responsible unless we give him the necessary and complete authority to do his job.

The opponents of these reorganization plans too often take the opposite view. It seems almost as if they cultivate conflict and diffusion of responsibility in administration because they do not really approve of the law designed to carry out a given public policy. Where they cannot succeed in getting the law rescinded or modified, they seem determined to prevent its proper execution.

It frequently happens that private interests affected by a law build up an advantageous relationship—advantageous to them—with the public agency or commission that administers the law. The organized bankers of this country quite frankly regard the Comptroller of the Currency as their sponsor in Washington, D. C. To cite another example, the Interstate Commerce Commission is regarded by some as overfriendly to the railroads. I would suppose that these agencies were created to protect the public interest rather than to act as the sponsor or guardian of some private interest.

Naturally, these groups that enjoy a favored position are reluctant to have any change, any reorganization that might jeopardize their position.

This leads me to observe that if we are sincere about our concern for the objectives of the Hoover Commission, if we are going to get the job of reorganization completed, we must hold high the concept of the public interest—high above the clamor of private interests opposed to specific reorganization plans. We must protect the main body of the Hoover Commission recommendations from being torn to shreds as if it were a carcass surrounded by snarling jackals.

Let me emphasize, as I have done before, that we are not committed to adopt each and every proposal made by the Hoover Commission. Each of these 300 or more recommendations is to be considered upon its merits. Sincere persons may differ about the worth and desirability of a particular reorganization proposal. There is no uniquely correct answer to every problem of governmental organization.

My remarks are not a brief for the Hoover Commission proposals in their entirety. Instead I plead for preservation of those basic principles which guided the Commission's work. To preserve those basic principles, we cannot allow ourselves to say that the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of Labor or some other department or agency head is not to be trusted with full authority over the affairs of his department or agency. We cannot justifiably oppose the reorganization plans of the President which are designed to establish the organization framework for good ad-

ministration throughout the executive branch.

Let us have these considerations in mind when we come to pass judgment in this House on those reorganization plans. Let us have an anxious regard for the public interest which must be served above all else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MERCHANT MARINE OPERATING SUBSIDIES

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the debates on Friday, May 5, 1950, with respect to the revision of the provision in the appropriations for the Maritime Commission which imposed a limit on the granting of operating subsidies and discussions with several of my colleagues in the House lead me to believe that it would be appropriate to amplify the record in several particulars.

I wish at the outset to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and to the members of his subcommittee for their understanding and patience in the many conversations which led to the revision of the provision referred to.

The following facts may be of some interest to the Members of the House.

There are presently 13 subsidized lines. These lines held contracts, commitments, authorizations, or obligations from the Maritime Commission on January 1, 1950, covering the operation of 243 privately owned vessels and 11 chartered vessels, 4 of which were of the freighter category. It appears that the four chartered freighter vessels will not continue under charter after July 1 of this year, although the passenger vessels probably will continue. The total number of vessels covered by existing subsidy contracts, authorizations, commitments, and so forth, as of January 1, 1950, is therefore 254. After adjustment to reflect the elimination of the chartered freighters, it is 250.

On January 1, 1950, there were six vessels under construction or contracts for construction by three companies. Three of these vessels are for the American President Lines, two for the American Export Lines and one for the United States Lines. I understand that only four of the six vessels are likely to be delivered during fiscal year 1951.

On January 1, 1950, there were applications for subsidy under consideration for 25 vessels. These applications have been filed by Arnold Bernstein Steamship Corp., South Atlantic Steamship Co., Gulf & South American Steamship Co., Pacific Far East Line, and Pacific Transport Lines. However, the 25 vessels covered by these applications include two major reconversions which may not be completed during fiscal year 1951. The two reconversions are passenger ships for the Arnold Bernstein Steamship Corp.

The minimum number of vessels required to take care of the vessels outlined in the preceding three paragraphs would be 277 after eliminating vessels that may not require subsidy in fiscal year 1951, either because of redelivery

of chartered vessels, reconversion, or delay in delivery of vessels under construction. The maximum number of vessels that could be covered by the three preceding paragraphs would be 285.

The amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole on May 5 permits the Maritime Commission to award operating-differential subsidies covering the full number of vessels in all three categories above outlined—namely, 285. It accomplishes this objective by fixing a ceiling on the number of vessels equal to the cumulative total of the vessels outlined in the three paragraphs before referred to. Assuming that the existing subsidized lines operate 250 subsidized vessels in fiscal year 1951, the Commission may subsidize 35 more vessels.

On January 1, 1950, there were about 600 American-flag vessels, excluding tankers, operating in the foreign trade. The 600 vessels in actual operation on that date represent a substantial reduction from the number previously operating, which exceeded 800 vessels during the fiscal year 1950. Moreover, the entire American-flag fleet carried substantially less than 50 percent of the cargo in the foreign trade in fiscal year 1950. The downward trend has been truly alarming. The effect of the appropriation bill would be to limit subsidies to a maximum of 285 of these 600 vessels. Therefore over 50 percent of the American-flag vessels engaged in the foreign trade will thus be precluded from receiving subsidy aid during fiscal year 1951.

Because of the growth of the foreign-flag merchant marine and the ability of foreign-flag vessels to operate at lower rate levels due primarily to lower wage costs than American-flag vessels, it has now become apparent that unsubsidized American-flag vessels are likely to be driven from the foreign trade except to the extent that they are embraced within the subsidy program. As a result, we are faced with the serious threat that the American-flag fleet in the foreign trade will be cut in half—from 600 to less than 300 vessels. This would be a condition adverse to the United States, its national defense, the national economy, and the foreign trade.

The purpose of an operating differential subsidy is to place the American shipowner in a position to compete with his foreign competitors in world trade without being at a substantial disadvantage with regard to wages and subsistence of officers and crews, repairs, and other items with regard to which Americans are at a substantial disadvantage in foreign competition. The payment of shipping subsidies never guarantees a profit to the operator. The operating subsidy is the only subsidy paid by the Government to any industry that is subject to repayment by the receiver. The operator must repay to the United States one-half of any profit in excess of 10 percent per annum upon the operator's capital investment necessarily employed in the operation of the subsidized vessels. During the 11 years from 1938 to December 31, 1948, inclusive, the total operating differential subsidy pay-

ments to all the lines were approximately \$87,953,000. The amount of such subsidy repaid or repayable to the Government as recapture was approximately \$52,438,000. The net subsidy for the 11-year period was, therefore, approximately \$35,515,000.

The seriousness of the situation with which we are confronted cannot be exaggerated. We are faced with a drastic reduction in the size and scope of our American merchant marine. We are confronted with the threat of reducing the participation of the American-flag merchant marine in the foreign trade to less than 25 percent, as contrasted with our objective of 50-percent participation. What this means in terms of idle vessels, less employment, impaired usefulness of the merchant marine as a naval auxiliary, loss of revenue to repair yards, stevedores, port authorities, and other business dependent upon patronage of American-flag vessels, as well as shipping interests dependent upon regular American-flag service is too obvious to need elaboration. The situation calls for action which will make it clear that the United States Government does not intend to abandon the seas to foreign-flag operators.

This matter is of particular concern to California and the area which I represent. On the west coast there is a substantial unemployment problem insofar as seamen, longshoremen, and other workers dependent on maritime employment are concerned. Any development which threatens a further reduction in employment of seamen, longshoremen, shipyard workers, and similar employees represents a serious danger to the economy of my area. It threatens the existence of the going organizations and the nucleus of skills which are required in times of emergencies to build, operate, and repair our ships, organizations and skills which we have desperately needed and found woefully inadequate in many of our seaports in the two great emergencies of the past few years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FREEDOM FAIR

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] mentioned the Freedom Fair, whereupon the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] said that talk about the Freedom Fair is like talking about Europe and he added, "What we are talking about here today is Uncle Sam's pocketbook."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a word about the Freedom Fair and Uncle Sam's pocketbook.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Washington Evening Star of last Friday captioned "Truman rejects plan to set up corporation for Freedom Fair" with a subheading "McGrath calls proposal of doubtful authority, urges Congress action."

I read the first two paragraphs of that article:

The White House today rejected a proposal by the National Capital Sesquicentennial

Commission to set up a nonprofit corporation to direct the business affairs connected with the operation of the Freedom Fair next year.

An opinion from Attorney General McGrath which went to the Commission from President Truman said that the plan was of doubtful legality and suggested that the Commission should seek specific authority from the Congress if it desires to proceed with its plan.

On Saturday last the Washington Evening Star ran another story captioned "Sesqui Commission studies decision on Freedom Fair," a story written with the byline William A. Millen. I read two paragraphs from that story:

The National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, now at the crossroads, will have to decide whether to hold a Freedom Fair or concentrate on a series of special events.

Mr. Massmann, the Commission's general manager, believes that if Freedom Fair is not held, about \$2,000,000, set aside for that purpose, will have to be returned to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I have had sent to me copies of the minutes of the meeting of the Sesquicentennial Commission of March 15, 1950. There was a discussion at that meeting regarding a letter dated March 7, 1950, directed to the President regarding three problems facing the Commission.

These three problems being first, the necessity of finding a site; second, the necessity for a ruling as to whether or not the Commission can grant authority to a nonprofit corporation; and third, the need for a survey to determine the interest of industry in participation.

I quote from the minutes:

The letter dated March 7, 1950, states in effect that if an adequate site is available, and if we have the authority to create a nonprofit corporation, it is the recommendation of the executive committee that a survey of industry be undertaken for a period not to exceed 4 months and that our liability for such a survey shall not exceed \$150,000 if we do not proceed with Freedom Fair. After full discussion of the problems involved and with the clear understanding that further action with regard to Freedom Fair must await a favorable ruling from the Attorney General, there was a motion by Mr. (Joseph C.) McGarraghy that the report and recommendations of the executive committee be approved.

This was seconded by Commissioner John Russell Young and the motion was unanimously carried.

I read further from the March 15 minutes:

Mr. Barron—

Meaning Mr. Carter T. Barron, Executive Vice President of the Commission—

voiced the opinion of those present when he stated that we owe it to Congress and ourselves to take steps and proceed with Freedom Fair or to abandon it.

Mr. Bastian—

That is Mr. Walter M. Bastian, general counsel of the Commission—

said he thought a ruling from the Attorney General might be forthcoming in about a week. It was agreed that if the ruling of the Attorney General is negative, we must announce the abandonment of Freedom Fair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of this action by the Commission and the recent ruling of the Attorney General of the United States, I propose to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that he have the appropriate subcommittee hold immediate hearings to ascertain whether the \$2,000,000 said to be unexpended can now be returned to the Federal Treasury in the interest of all of the taxpayers of the United States. Our committee should call in the executive officials of the Commission before we complete action on the omnibus appropriation bill. It can be done; it should be done tomorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on chapter IX, civil functions, general appropriation bill, 1951, today, may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH (at the request of Mr. TABER) was granted permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. TABER) was granted permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. D'EWARD (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and attach to each extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Dr. R. L. Meiling, Director of Medical Services under the Secretary of Defense; and also an address by Admiral William H. P. Blandy.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein certain material from a high-school student body in California, notwithstanding that it exceeds two pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$451.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 5, 1950, and two editorials from the Chicago Tribune of the same date.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. MCCONNELL (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1434. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7339. A bill to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 593. Resolution for the waiving of points of order against chapter XI of H. R. 7786, a bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and providing further for the waiving of points of order against an amendment to chapter XI, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 78. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 8411. A bill to provide for certain per capita payments to members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 8412. A bill to authorize the construction of certain irrigation and power projects in the Snake River Basin, Idaho, Wyo., and Oreg., and the Crooked River, Oreg., to establish a Snake River Basin ac-

count, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 8413. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 8414. A bill to authorize credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood-protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8415. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment-compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 8416. A bill to amend Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 8417. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the regulation of motor carriers engaged in commerce to and from the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8418. A bill to authorize loans to make available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 8419. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8420. A bill to provide for the reconstruction and repair of roads, bridges, or streets in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by floods in the spring of 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. Res. 591. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Rose Margaret Torrance; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6826, a bill to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8421. A bill for the relief of Bartula Posidel, Jordan Gic, Louis Bercari, Liberat Belulovic, Ivan Zgaljerdic, and Jospir Peras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 8422. A bill for the relief of Carmenclata von Plettenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 8423. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Mizumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 8424. A bill for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8425. A bill for the relief of Hirochichi Hamasaki and Shizu Hamasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8426. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Yabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8427. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Lui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2110. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Portland (Maine) Central Labor Union, opposing the reduction in mail service as ordered by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2111. By Mr. POLK: Petition of the Council of the Village of Hillsboro, Ohio, signed by Karl Doebele, Mayor, Charles L. Barger, President of Council, and W. J. Ludwick, Clerk, petitioning Congress to amend H. R. 6000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2112. By Mr. RICH: Resolution of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Galetton, Pa., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, bowing our heads and our hearts at this noontide altar, we would be still and know that Thou art God. When so many hopes are dashed to the ground, so many dreams shattered, help us to rest our minds in Thee and in the strength of those everlasting values which nothing can destroy.

Grant us sweet reasonableness in all our dealings with our fellow men and with each other. Make us large-hearted in helping and generous in criticizing. Keep us from unkind words and from unkind silences; yet sure and strong in the faith that is in us wherever we are called to stand in this epic hour may we strike our blow for the truth of God and the freedom of man. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 8, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses

thereon, and that Mr. KEE, Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. VORYS, and Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, the Committee on Finance and a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Martin
Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Millikin
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworschak	Langer	Stennis
Eaton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.